



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE ANGLO-SAXON VERSION OF THE BOOK OF PSALMS COMMONLY KNOWN AS THE PARIS PSALTER.

In consideration of the comparatively slight attention which has been hitherto given to the Anglo-Saxon Version of the Book of Psalms, preserved in the Paris MS. Bibliothèque Nationale, Fonds latin, 8824, and first published by Benjamin Thorpe, Oxford, 1855,¹ it has seemed not undesirable that a new study should be undertaken of the questions which concern the relation of this version to its Latin original. Apart from the intrinsic interest which a study of this subject might possess, it seemed especially desirable, in the present instance, in consequence of the question which has latterly been raised by Wülker (*Grundriss zur Geschichte der Angelsächsischen Litteratur*, III, § 501) with reference to the authorship of the prose portion of the Paris Psalter, a question on which the discovery of any hitherto unrecognized sources used by the Anglo-Saxon translator might be supposed to throw some light.

A reference to the bibliography of the Paris Psalter given by Wülker, *Grundriss*, III, §§ 424,—or rather to the contents of the works there cited,—will show how meagre was the literature of the subject at the date of this publication, 1885. Since the publication of the *Grundriss*, however, and, doubtless, under Prof. Wülker's influence, there has appeared the first attempt at an exhaustive investigation of either the prose or metrical divisions of the Paris Psalter. I refer to the article of J. Wichmann, entitled "König Aelfreds angelsächsische Übertragung der Psalmen I–LI Excl." *Anglia*, XI, 39–96, which deals with the prose division alone. Wichmann's article or dissertation bears evidence of having been prepared

¹*Libri Psalmorum, versio antiqua latina cum paraphrasi Anglo-Saxonica, partim soluta oratione, partim metricè composita, nunc primum e cod. MS. in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi adservato descripsit et edidit Benjamin Thorpe.*

with great industry at least. The purpose, however, with which he starts out,—namely, to substantiate Wülker's conjecture of Alfredian authorship,—leads him frequently, I think, to unwarranted conclusions in favor of that hypothesis on grounds that are ill-considered or even trivial, tends to vitiate his discussion. The change of face for example that we find on page 51 in the words: "so glaubhaft es nach vorangegangener untersuchung erschien in dem verfasser unserer übertragung einen kleriker zu vermuten, so entschieden sprechen dagegen mehrere stellen der bearbeitung selbst," will certainly come to most readers as a surprise which I do not believe will be entirely dissipated by the partial discussion of the cited passages (pp. 84–95)—for it is to be noted that all the passages cited do not meet with the promised discussion. I shall have occasion later on to speak in detail of the instances referred to above. More important, however, than the considerations just mentioned even is the fact which appears from the following investigation, that there were sources used by the translator of Ps. I–L, which escaped the researches of Wichmann, and in the light of which the question of authorship requires a new discussion.

Date of the MS. and identity of the scribe.

It is unnecessary to repeat the description of the MS. given in Thorpe's *Præfatio*, vi, which is supplemented by G. Tanger in his collation of the Paris Psalter with Thorpe's edition, *Anglia*, VI, *Anzeiger*, pp. 125–127.

The date of the MS. has been accepted, with little variation, as the eleventh century. The author of the descriptive text which accompanies the facsimile¹ from the Paris Psalter

¹ There are, also, facsimiles from the Paris Psalter (1) in Appendix B to Mr. Cooper's *Report on Rymer's Foedera* (undated). He reproduces Ps. 150, verses 2 and 3, also a portion of the last page of the volume in which the Psalter is preserved, including the scribe's note at the end and the Duke of Berry's signature. (2) *Paleographia Sacra Pictoria* by J. O. Westwood,

of the Anglo-Saxon introduction to Ps. 45, in J. B. Silvestre's *Paléographie Universelle* (Paris, 1841 ff., Plate ccxxxi), speaks of the MS. as "généralement assigné au XII^e siècle"—on no authority, however, as far as I can discover. Dietrich, Grein and Wülker (see Wichmann, *Anglia*, XI, p. 63) have concurred in assigning it to the preceding century. It is more important, perhaps, that I am able to add to the opinions of these scholars the authority of two eminent palæographers, the late Sir Frederic Madden, and M. Leopold Delisle, director-general of the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. In a copy of the Paris Psalter presented to Sir Frederic Madden by his "good friend, Dr. Bliss, November 23, 1835," as appears from the words which he has written on the title-page, I find opposite Thorpe's note, *Præfatio*, vii, "e manu judicans, codicem seculi duodecimi esse dixerim" the words, "certainly of the 11th. F. M.," with an interjection expressive of contempt added. Fifteen years later when he came to translate the *Paléographie Universelle* of Silvestre, he expressed the same opinion, though with less impatience, in his "*Universal Palæography*, translated from the French, and edited with corrections and notes" (London, 1850), II, 638, note. The words there are: "More probably of the eleventh century." This conclusion agrees with that adopted by Wichmann (p. 63 f.). His "Cott. B, IV" is presumably "Cott. Tiberius B, IV," a leaf from which is reproduced in facsimile in *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, Plate 20.

The opinion of M. Delisle is found in his article entitled "Notes sur la Bibliothèque de la sainte Chapelle de Bourges," *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes*. Quatrième Série, Tom. II, p. 147 f., 1856. He pronounces the handwriting "écriture anglo-saxonne du onzième siècle." As appears from this description, the MS. of which our Psalter forms a part contains

London, 1843-45, Plate No. II, illustrating Anglo-Saxon Psalters, contains a reproduction of Ps. 45, verse 1 (in part), together with signature of the Duke of Berry. The different impression as to the handwriting of the MS. which is produced by these different facsimiles makes one despair.

other pieces. "Après le psautier ont été transcrits différents cantiques sacrés, le symbole de saint Athanase, et les litanies des Saints." The MS. was written, as M. Delisle observes, apparently for a woman. "C'est ce qu'on peut conjecturer de la formule d'une oraison copiée au fol. 195 v." col. 2. "Te deprecor, Domine michi famule (*vel* famulo) tue (*vel* tuo) et famulis et famulabus tuis per intercessionem, &c." There are important inferences to be drawn, I think, from the statements with reference to two points of so experienced a palæographer as M. Delisle.

1. The inference that the whole of the Paris Psalter was written by one hand. Making no distinction as to the parts of the books in which it is found, he observes, "Le copiste s'est fait connaître par cette souscription : Hoc psalterii carmen regis David, etc."—the concluding note of the volume. This is contrary to the suggestion of Wichmann (p. 42) that the Latin and Anglo-Saxon columns were not by the same scribe.

2. The handwriting is Anglo-Saxon. This is contrary to Thorpe's suggestion—made for reasons that will later appear—that the MS. was the work of a Gallic monk. A palæographer so familiar with all periods of French chirography as M. Delisle, would hardly have pronounced the handwriting in that event as "écriture anglo-saxonne."

After the weight of opinion indicated above which has been almost unchallenged, we may safely accept the eleventh century as the period when our manuscript was written. There is only one other circumstance of interest which M. Delisle points out in regard to the MS. This is the remarkable position which is assigned to Saint Martial, the Apostle of Limousin, in the Litanies of the Saints which conclude the volume. He is there placed on the same level with the Apostles and Evangelists. Anglo-Saxon Saints, however, largely predominate in these litanies which M. Delisle has printed entire, pp. 148–151.

On observing the identity between the names of the scribes of the Paris Psalter and of the Cotton MS. Otho, C. 1, one of the MSS. of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, I was encouraged to believe that a clue had been found which would enable me to fix the locality, also, in which the Psalter was written. I say identity, notwithstanding a slight but common variation which appears in comparing the name as it is found in the Anglo-Saxon and Latin forms respectively, that is to say, *Wulfwi* in the first, *Wulfwinus* in the second. Compare, for instance, the name of the bishop of Dorchester in Oxfordshire, given in the Abingdon chronicle for the year 1053, with the same name in its Latinized form as it appears in Florence of Worcester, *Monumenta Hist. Britannica*, p. 624, *Wulfwinus* as well as *Wulfwius*. Similarly, the name of the Abbot of Newminster, who occupied that dignity from 1034 to 1057, appears in the *Liber de Hyda* as *Elfwy* by the side of *Alwinus* (*Fasti Monastici aevi Saxonici*, by W. de Gray Birch, London, 1872, Preface, VII).

The note in which is disclosed the name of the scribe of the Paris Psalter occurs at the end of the volume. It is as follows: Hoc Psalterii carmen inclyti regis David, sacer Di Wulfwinus [cognoñto cada] manu sua conscripsit. Quicumque legerit scriptum Animae suae expetiat votum (Thorpe, Facsimile, No. 2). The words enclosed in brackets have been added above the line in what seems to me to be a different hand.

The scribe of the Cotton MS. Otho, C. 1, similarly reveals his name in a note at the end of the Gospel of St. John, the words being *Wulfwi me wrat*. So the correct form of the name has been given by Professor J. W. Bright (see the *Gospel of St. Luke in Anglo-Saxon*, Oxford, 1893, Introduction, XIII, from which passage my knowledge of the other facts relating to this MS. was first obtained). The age of Otho, C. 1, has been accepted by both Skeat and Bright as, approximately, the beginning of the eleventh century. A charter inserted between the Gospels of St. Luke and St. John relates to

Malmesbury in Wiltshire, and would seem to fix sufficiently the locality where Wulfwi wrote.

The age to which the scribes of the two MSS. belong, as has been seen, agrees sufficiently. For though the Paris Psalter may have been written somewhat later in the eleventh century, the two works might well come within the period of one man's activity. Unfortunately, however, a comparison¹ of the handwriting of Otho, C. 1, with the facsimile leaf from the Paris Psalter contained in Silvestre's *Paléographie Universelle* (Plate ccxxxI) made at the British Museum,—a comparison not altogether satisfactory, but the only one possible under the circumstances,—does not confirm the supposition of identity.

The matter, however, is not quite ended with this result. If the conjecture which I shall now mention were correct, the non-identity of hands would be explained, and the scribes who bear the same name and belong to the same age might, after all, have been one person. The conjecture to which I refer is, namely, that of the first editor of the Paris Psalter, Benjamin Thorpe, who was inclined to regard the whole of the MS. as a copy, the note which reveals the name of the scribe, as well as the rest. His words, stating his reasons for this opinion, are as follows :

“Non videtur omnino incredibile codicem nostrum eum non esse quem scripsit Wulfwinus ipse, sed descriptionem ejus a monacho quopiam Gallo factam qui Saxonicae linguae prorsus ignarus esset; nec facile est animo concipere errores paene innumeros quibus refertus est liber aliunde, oriri potuisse: vix enim potuit ipse Wulfwinus in suo ipsius nomine scribendo tam negligens fuisse” (Præfatio, vi).

Bouterwek (*Angelsächsisches Glossar*, Elberfeld und Iserlohn, 1850, XXI) speaks with favor of the conjecture here advanced by Thorpe. For my own part, however, I would

¹This comparison was kindly made for me at the British Museum by Edward Scott, Esq., with the result indicated in the text.

rather subscribe to the opinion expressed in Sir F. Madden's marginal note to the above passage: "Not at all probable." That the Paris Psalter in each of its divisions represents a copy and not the original MS. of the Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalms, is not only an opinion which has nothing strange in itself, but is a necessary conclusion from considerations which will be touched on later. Mistakes such as *didum* for *tidum* (Ps. 11, 1), *lve* for *let* (Ps. 35, 10), *innandundum* for *innancundum* (Ps. 118, 2), *heortad* for *heortan* (Ps. 139, 2), besides others which Thorpe has recorded (pp. 441-446) are certainly singular as coming from an Anglo-Saxon copying a document in his own language.¹ The question is one which does not admit of convincing proof, either one way or the other, but, after all, the number of errors, considering the great bulk of the Anglo-Saxon version, does not seem to me to be greater than might be looked for from an ignorant priest, such a one as might be expected to feel the greatest interest in a vernacular translation. Surely, a foreign copyist who was entirely ignorant of the language he was copying, as Thorpe supposes, would have left us a larger number of flagrant errors than we find in the Psalter as we have it.

To consider, however, what is especially to our purpose, the evidence of the concluding note of the Paris Psalter, there are two circumstances which seem to have excited Thorpe's suspicion that this was also copied, like the text itself, from a MS. which lay before the scribe of the Paris Psalter.

1. The use of *sacer*, the adjective, instead of the correct *sacerdos*, in the phrase *Sacer Dī*.
2. The addition of the words *cognōmto cada*.

¹ They are not more singular, however, than those which Sievers enumerates *Anglia*, XIII, 311 f., from the *Rule of St. Benet*, *srig* for *frig*, *fers* for *reps*, and many others. Even more to the point are the many senseless forms due to the copyist which are found in the *Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter*, edited by Karl J. Bülbring, London, 1891, E. E. T. S., No. 97, Preface, IX.

The first of these circumstances seems to me rather to confirm the view that the note is original with the copyist of the Paris Psalter, inasmuch as it appears much more likely that a man rather ignorant of Latin, such as, under any supposition, the writer of this note, as we have it, must have been, would erroneously use *sacer* for *sacerdos* on his own account, than that in copying from a MS. which contained the correct form *sacerdos* he should change it to *sacer*. To explain the second circumstance also, it does not seem necessary, for those holding the view that the note is original with the scribe of the Paris Psalter, to suppose that the writer committed a blunder in writing his own name. The words *cognōm̃to cada* would seem rather to have been a later addition by a different person who probably knew the full name of the copyist and added the surname to the simple "Wulfwinus" for better distinction. We have certainly a few additions by a second hand in the body of the Anglo-Saxon translation, which Thorpe himself has recorded, namely, the gloss *scuan* over *sceade*, Ps. 90, 4 (see Thorpe, 444), *t* added to *oft*, Ps. 5, 43 (Thorpe, 443), *yrmingas* changed to *yrmingces*, Ps. 13, 10 (Thorpe, 443). It would not be surprising, then, if the surname had been added by a later hand.¹

¹ Before quitting the subject of the identity of this scribe, I must enter a protest against the wholly arbitrary manner in which Wichmann (p. 64, f.) seizing upon the name of Bishop Wulfwi mentioned in the Abingdon Chronicle for the year 1053, and Florence of Worcester (*Monumenta Historica Britannica*, 624) has assumed that he was identical with our scribe. His only reason for doing so seems to have been that the Index of the *Monumenta* supplied him with the name of no other Wulfwi or Wulfwius. Surely there must have been more than one person bearing this name in Anglo-Saxon times besides the above mentioned bishop. As a matter of fact, *Wulfwig*, which is identical with it, is found in the Anglo-Saxon Genealogies (s. Sweet, *Oldest English Texts*, p. 631). It may be remarked in passing that there was no "Kloster Leogorensis" as Wichmann (p. 65) interprets Florence of Worcester. The *Praesules Leogorenses* of this writer were the Bishops of Dorchester in Oxfordshire, the seat of the Episcopal See which was removed to Lincoln about the year 1086. No abbey was founded in Dorchester till about the year 1140 (s. Dugdale's *Monasticon Anglicanum*, new edition by Caley, Ellis and Bandinel, London, 1830. Vol. VI, Part I, p. 323).

History of the MS.

An autograph note at the end of the MS.—“Ce livre est au duc de Berry-Jehan,” (Thorpe, Facsimile 2)—gives us our earliest authentic knowledge of the history of the book. This Jean, Duke of Berry (1340–1416), was brother of Charles V, King of France, whom he rivalled in the magnificence of his collections of books and treasures of art. The possession of our MS. by Duke Jean is all that was known concerning its history to Thorpe (*Praefatio*, vi) and Wichmann (p. 41).

However, I am able to supply a considerable number of details which, taken together, form a sufficiently complete account of the vicissitudes to which it has been subjected from the beginning of the fifteenth century down to the present time. My attention was first directed to the subject by some of the details given in the descriptive and historical text accompanying Plate CCXXXI of Silvestre's *Paléographie Universelle*. I subsequently discovered still other details throwing light upon the story of our MS. in a publication of somewhat later date than Silvestre's great work, containing in part an account of documents not known to the authors of the letter-press to the *Paléographie Universelle*. I refer to the *Memoires de la Commission historique du Cher*, Vol. I, Bourges, 1855. The first of the memoirs—by M. Hiver de Beauvoir—covering pp. 1–127, contains a very elaborate account of the collections of MSS. and art treasures which were in the possession of the Duke, and was the occasion of the article of M. Delisle I have already quoted from. I have also consulted M. Delisle's *Cabinet des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Impériale (Nationale)*, I, 56 ff., *Librairie du duc Jean de Berry*, III, 172 ff., Appendix to *Librairie du duc Jean* and the *Voyage Littéraire de deux Religieux Benedictins de la congregation de Saint Maur*, Paris, 1717. As MM. Champollion-Figeac et Aimé Champollion Fils, authors of the descriptive text of the *Paléographie Universelle*, however, had before them the inventories, now pre-

served in different libraries of Paris, of the books of the Sainte Chapelle of Bourges which are not accessible to me, I shall follow their account, indicating additions to their knowledge which I have derived from other sources.

It will be seen from this account that the Paris Psalter was one of a series of gifts made by Duke Jean towards the end of his life to the canons of his recent foundation, the Sainte Chapelle at Bourges, being promised them in the year 1404 and delivered in the year 1406. As is suggested by the MM. Champollion, the book probably came into his possession during his nine years' sojourn as a hostage in England, after the peace of Brétigny, 1360. The authors of the descriptive text named above, state that they had before them, (1) "l'état des manuscrits délivrés alors (that is, 1406) à Arnoul Belin, premier trésorier, et aux chanoines de cette église d'après les ordres du duc par Robinet d'Étampes," (2) "un autre document, non moins curieux pour l'histoire de ces mêmes manuscrits—la copie de l'inventaire des livres existant dans la bibliothèque de la Sainte Chapelle de Bourges, dressé le 17 Novembre, 1552,"¹ (3) "une troisième liste, mais celle-ci est du milieu du dernier siècle, contient les titres de la plupart des plus beaux manuscrits indiqués dans le premier état et le troisième article de cette liste est ainsi conçu 'Les heures du duc Jean, reliées en long; à côté du latin, il y a une colonne d'une traduction qu'on croit d'ancien Anglo-saxon ou d'hongrois.'"

The inference of the MM. Champollion from the traditional title "Les Heures du Duc Jean," that the volume was so-called because it was dedicated to the personal use of the Duke is hardly correct. The volumes in the Duke's collection bearing this title are so numerous that M. Delisle has devoted a special series of articles to them: *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, February, April and May, 1884. Our authors con-

¹ This Latin inventory has been published by M. Delisle, *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 4^e série, Tome II, pp. 144-146. The Paris Psalter is to be identified with the entry "Psalterium Davidis."

tinue: "Mais nous croyons aussi reconnaître ce même manuscrit dans cette description qui est le septième article de l'état des manuscrits donnés à la Sainte Chapelle de Bourges le 6 juillet 1406 [i. e., the first of the lists mentioned above. The editors paraphrased the language of the article. I restore the original form, Hiver de Beauvoir, *Mémoire*, p. 97]. 'Un très ancien Psautrier, historié d'ouvrage romain, et au commencement de David jouant de la harpe, et sur les fueillet, paint des armes de France et de Boulougne, couvert de vielle soye, à deux tixus dont en l'un n'a point de fermoir.' Ces mêmes mots se lisent dans l'inventaire de la bibliothèque du duc, dressé en 1402."

The authors then point out how this description tallies with that of the Paris Psalter and explain the only missing feature, namely, the figure of David at the beginning playing on the harp, in the following words: "Ce volume ayant été de nouveau relié en maroquin rouge avec les armes de France sur les plats, vers le milieu du dernier siècle, et le commencement n'existant plus, nous ne pouvons retrouver la figure de David qui avait péri vraisemblablement quand ce volume fut cédé, avec plusieurs autres, par l'église de Bourges à la bibliothèque du roi." The accident here referred to, no doubt, befell the Psalter on the occasion of the sack of Bourges in 1562, during the religious wars. The rich ornaments on the backs of the books, preserved in the Sainte Chapelle, attracted, it seems, the cupidity of the soldiers (*Mémoire*, p. 95).

Our MS., then, passed into the possession of the Sainte Chapelle in 1406.¹ This will explain why it is not mentioned in the *Bibliothèque Prototypographique ou Librairies des fils du Roi Jean, Charles V, Jean de Berri, Philippe de Bourgogne et les siens*, Paris, 1830,—a fact which surprised Thorpe (*Præfatio*, vi),—for, as I learn from Delisle's *Cabinet des Manuscrits*, I, 56, the inventory of the Duke of Berry's books,

¹ It had already been enumerated among those promised in still another inventory of 1404 (see Hiver, *Mémoire*, p. 97). This inventory was not known to the authors of the descriptive text.

used in this work, was not taken till 1416,—and then by order of his executors on the occasion of his death.

The next notice of the Paris Psalter, as far as I discover—one to which I was first directed by a marginal note of Sir F. Madden's—is more than a hundred and fifty years later than the inventory of 1552, mentioned above by the MM. Champollion.

This notice has a special interest, I think, inasmuch as it shows that Gérard Gley (the discoverer of the Munich *Heliand* MS.) was not the first scholar whose attention was attracted by the Paris Psalter, as Thorpe, *Præfatio*, iii, supposed. Gley's treatise, *Langue et Littérature des anciens Francs*, in which mention¹ is made of the Paris Psalter at p. 276 (see the passage quoted by Thorpe, *Præfatio*, iii), was published at Paris in 1814. Already, however, in the *Voyage littéraire de deux Religieux Benedictins de la Congregation de Saint Maur* [Martène and Durand], Paris, 1717, I, 28 f., there occurs a notice of our MS. which was still at the Sainte Chapelle in Bourges in 1708, the year that the journey of research of these scholars was undertaken. The severe measures formerly adopted by the Archbishops of Bourges for the preservation of the library of the Sainte Chapelle had been long relaxed, and at the time of the visit of the author of this part of the voyage—Dom Martène—only fifty or sixty volumes remained of the original collection. The place where they were stored was used, also, as a poultry house. The books, being left open on the desks, were, of course, in a pitiable condition,

¹The occasion of Gley's reference to the Paris Psalter, entirely incidental, does not appear from Thorpe's quotation but is curious. It is in connection with the idea which he expresses cautiously that the Normans did not abandon entirely the Norse language, even after they had become familiar with French, and so were able to read the cognate dialect, Anglo-Saxon—"comprenaient sans doute l'Anglo-Saxon aussi facilement que l'ancien normand." The Psalter, then which was found in a French library, probably came from the Dukes of Normandy.—*Langue et Littérature des anciens Francs*, pp. 275–6.

and one of these was the Paris Psalter. The words of Dom Martène relating to this book are as follows :

“L’un des plus curieux manuscrits de la Sainte Chapelle est celui qu’on appelle les heures du duc Jean. C’est un psautier latin avec une version angloise de six ou sept cens ans. Ceux qui me la montrèrent, croyoient que c’était de l’allemand ou de l’hebreu. Mais sîtôt que je l’eus vu, je connus le caractère Anglo-Saxon. J’en fus encore plus convaincu, lorsqu’examinant les litanies qui sont à la fin, je trouvai que la plûpart des Saints étoient d’Angleterre. Ce livre est conservé dans le chartriers.”

It only remains to say that our MS. finally passed into the possession of the Bibliothèque du roi (now the National Library of France), being one of the remnant of the ancient library of the Sainte Chapelle, which the canons presented to Louis XV in 1752 (s. *Delisle, Bibl. de l’École des Chartes*, 4^e série, II, p. 147. Cf., also, inventory of 1752 referred to above in the work of Silvestre).

The Latin Rubrics.

With reference to the Latin rubrics which regularly head the Psalms in the Paris Psalter, we have the following statement of Thorpe’s (*Præfatio*, p. vi): “Ex rubricis Latinis plurimæ adeo scatent barbarismis ut vix intelligi possint.”

The subject receives no further mention in his preface and is passed over in silence by Wichmann. We should have in our hands, however, the true key to the emendation of these rubrics, if they should prove not to be original, and if we should be able to detect the actual source from which they were drawn. After long and toilsome search, I am able to supply this key which escaped the investigations of Thorpe. With the exception of a few cases of divergence which I shall discuss below, the source in question is in each instance the argument prefixed to the corresponding psalm in the voluminous Latin commentary on the Psalms entitled *In Psalmorum*

Librum Exegesis, now most accessible in Migne's *Patrologiae Latinae cursus completus*, XCIII, 478–1098. The above commentary which I shall cite simply as *Exegesis* was once generally regarded as a work of the Venerable Bede, on the strength of its being included as such by his editors in the earlier editions of Bede's collected works. I shall have occasion, in another section, to speak more fully of this question of authorship.

As will be seen from the examples printed below, the arguments which accompany each psalm in the above mentioned commentary consist regularly of two divisions, the first of which presents an historical interpretation of the particular psalm, and the second, in closer conformity to the medieval spirit, a mystical interpretation, according to which the Psalm is conceived as the voice of Christ, or of the Church, or of the Apostles. In the Latin rubrics of the Paris Psalter, we do not anywhere find a reproduction of one of these arguments in full. On the other hand, the rubrics are, indeed, made up of entire sentences, in rare instances, or as a rule, of parts of sentences which are derived from the corresponding arguments. The obscurity, then, which perplexed the editor of the Paris Psalter is due to the abbreviated or fragmentary form in which these rubrics appear as compared with their originals. Corruptions of the text in copying have come in to render the obscurity, natural in such a relation, still greater.

As I shall reproduce in full the arguments to the first fifty psalms further on in another connection, I shall, in this place, only cite specimens of these arguments to illustrate the relation which exists between them and the Latin rubrics of the Paris Psalter. As the rubrics, however, to the last hundred psalms are also drawn from the corresponding arguments in *Exegesis*, I shall cite them in the following categories along with the rest, although they do not properly come within the plan of this study, so that all rubrics of the Paris Psalter, the metrical as well as the prose division, will be seen to be derived from *Exegesis*.

Distinguishing five kinds of relations in which the different rubrics of the Paris Psalter stand to their corresponding sentences in the arguments of *Exegesis*, I shall illustrate each relation by one example, citing after it the other psalms which exhibit the same relation.

It should be premised that the Latin rubrics of seven psalms¹ are wanting in our MS., viz., Ps. 22, 32, 38, 51, 80, 97, 109. The rubric for Ps. 30, which had been overlooked by Thorpe, was recovered by Tanger, *Anglia*, VI, Anz., p. 131, n.

1. The rubric of the Paris Psalter is identical with a sentence or sentences of the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*. For example, Ps. 10 :

Vox Christi est. Lege ad Genesim : perditio Sodomae. Thorpe, p. 20.

Aliter vox Christi est. Lege ad Genesim. Perditio Sodomae. *Exegesis*, p. 544.

So likewise : Ps. 3, 9 (only punctuation different), 16, 19, 20, 25, 29, 30, 37, 39 (only Psalter has *Christus* for *Christum*.—*Exegesis*, 692), 40, 48, 53, 55, 57, 59 (only *apostoli* for *apostolorum*.—*Exegesis*, 792), 61, 63, 64, 68, 70, 71, 72, 75, 76, 77, 78 (only *post passionem* instead of *de passione*.—*Exegesis*, 910), 81 (only *ad Judaeos* instead of *de Judaeis*.—*Exegesis*, 924), 87, 88, 91, 98, 104, 105, 106, 111 (only *conversionis* instead of *reversionis*.—*Exegesis*, 1038), 115, 121, 122, 123, 124, 127, 128, 131, 133, 137, 138, 143 (only the Vulgate title used), 144, 145, 146, 148. Thus fifty-three in all. There are seven psalms besides, which show the same identity with very slight variations. They may be arranged most conveniently under this head, and are as follows : (a) identical, with slight change of order, Ps. 85, 93, 147 ; (b) identical, except for slight substitution of words, 15 (Psalter has *oravit* for *deprecatur*.—*Exegesis*, 557), 18 (*David* for *pro-*

¹ As two of the three works which enter especially into the following discussion show the Vulgate numbering of the Psalms, I shall cite according to that numbering throughout.

pheta.—*Exegesis*, 579; *dicit* is, also, differently placed), 35 (*dicit* for *dicitur*.—*Exegesis*, 666, cf. Tanger, p. 132), 56 (*quando fugiebat* for *cum fugeret*.—*Exegesis*, 778. This is from the Vulgate title only).

2. The rubric of the Paris Psalter reproduces sentence or sentences of the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*, in fragmentary or abbreviated form. For example, Ps. 44:

Propheta de Christo ad Ecclesiam dicit de regina auri (sic). Thorpe, p. 109.

Propheta de Christo ad Ecclesiam dicit, *legendus ad Evangelium Matthaei* de regina Austri. *Exegesis*, 714.

Or Ps. 67, to illustrate another variety of abbreviation:

Prophetae (sic) resurrectionem Christi. Thorpe, p. 166.

Propheta resurrectionem Christi *et posteriores glorias annuntiat*. *Exegesis*, 828.

So likewise: Ps. 1, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 26, 28, 33 (punctuation, also, different), 34, 42, 47, 52, 54, 60, 62, 66 (Psalter has, also, *benedicebant* for *benedicerent*.—*Exegesis*, 825), 73 (cf. Tanger, *Anglia*, VI, Anz., p. 136), 82, 90, 94, 95, 99, 100, 101, 103, 107, 108, 114, 134 (*Exegesis* contains much besides this Vulgate rubric), 140, 149. Thus thirty-five in all. To these are to be added three Psalms which show the same peculiarity with slight change of order, viz., Ps. 5, 41, 150.

3. The rubrics of the Paris Psalter are identical with a sentence or sentences of *Exegesis*, with the addition, however, of certain words in the Psalter. To make the relation obvious I will give these rubrics italicizing the words not found in *Exegesis*.

Ps. 65. Vox Christi et Apostolorum ad populum.—Cf. *Exegesis*, 819.

Ps. 79. Vox Apostolorum pro Ecclesia et Christi ad Patrem (*Exegesis* has *de* for *pro*, *Dominum* for *Patrem*, 914).

Ps. 84. Vox apostolica de novello populo, *ad Dominum* (*Exegesis*, 935, has here, also, *ad novellum populum*).

Ps. 86. *In finem* filiis Chore Psalmus Cantici. Vox apostolica de ecclesia.—*Exegesis*, 944.

Ps. 92. *Vox populi*. Redditum de Babyloniae (sic) (cf. Tanger, p. 137; *Exegesis*, 981).

Ps. 96. *Alleluia*. Vox Ecclesiae ad adventum Christi (*Exegesis*, 990, has *Domini* for *Christi*).

Ps. 116. *Alleluia*. Vox Apostolorum *ad gentes*. (This evidently suggested by preceding sentence of the argument . . . non solos Judaeos sed etiam omnes gentes ad laudandum convocat Dominum.)—*Exegesis*, 1048.

Ps. 118. Vox Christi ad Patrem de Judaeis et passione sua; *et de adventu suo et ejus regno et judicis*.—*Exegesis*, 1052.

Ps. 119. Canticum graduum. Vox Christi ad Patrem *in passione* de Judaeis.—*Exegesis*, 1084.

Ps. 120. Vox Ecclesiae ad Apostolos *vel ad Christum*. Canticum graduum.—*Exegesis*, 1087.

Ps. 125. Vox Apostolorum de impiis Judaeis *ad Deum*. Canticum Graduum.—*Exegesis*, 1090.

Ps. 126. Vox Christi de futura Ecclesia; ad populum dicit (Argument has, also, *ad futuram Ecclesiam* for *de futura Ecclesia*).—*Exegesis*, 1090.

Ps. 130. Canticum Graduum. Vox ecclesiae regnantis, *vel sanctae Mariae*.—*Exegesis*, 1091.

Ps. 132. Vox ecclesiae *regnantis*.—*Exegesis*, 1092.

Thus fourteen in all.

4. The rubric of the Paris Psalter is an adaptation of a sentence or sentences in the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*. Departures from the expression of the original are very slight.

For example, Ps. 4:

Vox Christi in cruce quando positus fuit. Thorpe, p. 5.
. . . . Aliter Arnobius exponit quia Deus justitiae exaudivit in cruce positum filium suum.—*Exegesis*, p. 501.

So likewise; Ps. 2, 23, 27, 31, 36, 46, 49, 50, 69, 83 (cf. Tanger, p. 137), 89, 110.

5. The rubric of the Paris Psalter shows no connection with the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*.

These are: Ps. 21 (Rubric—Vox Christi ad Patrem in cruce elevati—was evidently suggested by the opening verse of the

Psalm—Deus, Deus meus respice in me ; quare me dereliquisti. Cf. the cry of our Lord, St. Matthew, XXVII, 46), 24, 45, 58, 74, 102, 112, 113, 117 (Rubric—Alleluia, Ut ostendatur hominibus via, id est, Christus, per quam ingreditur ad portam vitae—suggested by verse 19 of same psalm—haec porta Domini, justi intrabunt per eam), 129, 135, 139, 141, 142. Thus fourteen in all.

In the case of all these Psalms just enumerated the rubrics of the Paris Psalter embody mystical interpretations. In the case of all but five, Ps. 102, 112, 117, 135, 139, the arguments of *Exegesis*, contrary to the rule, do not offer any mystical interpretation whatever. This deficiency of the original explains why the transcriber of the rubrics was put to his own invention or the use of other sources in supplying what was evidently the line of interpretation he preferred.

The five remaining cases of divergence which, it is to be noted, all occur in the metrical division of the Psalter, are, I think, also susceptible of explanation.

Ps. 102. Vox Ecclesiae ad *Patrem* suum. This differs from the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*, 999, only in the use of the word *Patrem* for *populum*. The difference could easily be the result of careless transcription, or might rest on a difference of reading between the MS. employed by the transcribers and that which forms the basis of Migne's text.

Ps. 112. Vox Ecclesiae *cum laude Christi*—differs only in having the italicised words instead of *de fidelibus suis*.—*Exegesis*, 1039. Perhaps, again, a difference of reading. The words seem to have been suggested by the character of the Psalm, which begins *Laudate, pueri, Dominum*.

Ps. 117. Rubric, as stated before, no doubt, suggested by verse 19, but I see no reason for the substitution. Perhaps, again, a difference of reading. Cf. *Exegesis*, 1048.

Ps. 135. Alleluia, Vox Ecclesiae. Appears to be taken by mistake or simply repeated from argument of the preceding Psalm where these words occur. This is rendered more probable by analogy of Ps. 139.

Ps. 139. In finem. Psalmus David, Vox Petri. Evidently taken by mistake or repeated inadvertently from argument to Ps. 138, the only one in *Exegesis* where the words *Vox Petri* occur. The mistake made in case of this Psalm and Ps. 135 would be especially easy, if the MS. from which the rubrics were transcribed resembled towards its close that which was used by the editors of *Exegesis*—that is to say, one in which the arguments followed immediately on each other, separated only by brief *Explanationes*, the intervening commentary failing from Ps. 122 on.

To complete the list of rubrics, I have only to name those of Ps. 6, 7, 43, 136. Ps. 6, 136 (cf. Vulgate title), in respect to one clause, belong under 1; in respect to the other, under 4. Ps. 7 shows its second clause, *Et Ezechias ab hostibus*, is taken in abbreviated form from *Exegesis*, 515. The first clause, with its mystical interpretation, *Vox Christi ad Patrem de Judæis*, was added by the transcriber because his original, being exclusively historical, supplied him with nothing of the kind. Ps. 43 belongs partly under 1, partly under 3.

It is seen, then, that in every instance except those already enumerated under 5, the rubrics are manifestly drawn from the arguments of *Exegesis*, and even, in the case of the Psalms under this last division, the obvious cause of divergence has been pointed out, an insignificant number excepted, in which the difficulty is, also, susceptible of reasonable explanation.

It is to be observed in connection with the preference for a mystical method of interpretation pointed out above that this is especially noticeable in the metrical division of the Psalter.

Mystical interpretations are, indeed, supplied, as we have seen, in the case of Ps. 7, 21, 24, 45, in the prose division, also, where such were wanting in the original. In the six instances, moreover, in the prose division, where only the historical interpretations are represented in the rubrics, viz., Ps. 20, 23, 26, 31, 33, 37, we find that in the first two the original supplied the transcriber only with historical interpretations. Nevertheless, in the other four instances, we find him tran-

scribing only historical interpretations, though both mystical and historical ones were at his disposal in the original, and showing, therefore, no marked preference for the former. Finally, the rubrics of Ps. 5, 7, 14, 15, 43, in this division show historical and mystical interpretations side by side in the same line.

On the other hand, in the metrical division the transcriber never selects an historical interpretation when there is a choice in the original of historical or mystical, and in no instance does he mingle historical and mystical interpretations in his rubrics. Exclusively historical, often obscure from abbreviation, are the rubrics of Ps. 56, 60, 62, 66, 73, 92, 143 only; of these the rubrics to Ps. 56 and 143 are identical with the Vulgate titles and so do not come into consideration. In the case of the remaining five, the rubrics of the Paris Psalter are drawn from the characteristic historical interpretations of *Exegesis* for the reason that in these psalms the usual alternative mystical interpretations were wanting. The same was true, as we have seen, of Ps. 58, 74, 113, 129, 141, 142, also, but here the mystical interpretations, evidently so necessary for the satisfaction of the transcriber's mind, were supplied, notwithstanding.

The more marked prevalence of mystical interpretation which the rubrics seem to show after Ps. 50, is evidently due, I think, to the fact that in this portion of his work the rubricator was free from the influence of the Anglo-Saxon introductions containing historical matter which lay before him for the first fifty psalms.¹

¹ It only remains to inquire, In the cases of divergence noted above are the interpretations—mystical in character—which are supplied by the transcriber, original with him or not?

When the transcriber of the rubrics desired interpretations of the character just mentioned, yet failed to find them in his accustomed source—the arguments of *Exegesis*—nothing would seem more natural than that he should have resorted to the succinct exegetical introductions to the Psalms entitled *Explanationes*, which in our Commentary follow immediately upon the Vulgate titles, preceding the Commentary proper. These *Explanationes* are exclusively devoted to a mystical interpretation of the Psalms.

The Anglo-Saxon Introductions.

I shall next proceed to consider the curious Anglo-Saxon arguments or introductions which are found preceding each psalm of the prose division of the Paris Psalter except Ps. 1, 21, 26. It is, probably, due to the negligence of the scribe alone that similar arguments have not been preserved in the case of these three psalms as for the rest.

As a matter of fact, there are three cases, Ps. 58, 74, 141, in which the *Explanaciones* might seem to have supplied the corresponding rubrics of the Psalter. I place these below with the necessary extracts from the *Explanaciones* in order that the relation may be made clear.

Ps. 58. Vox Christi ad Patrem de Judaeis.—Thorpe, p. 144.

Primo ingressu psalmi orat Dominus ne ei inimici nocere praevaleant; secundo prosequitur quemadmodum in fine saeculi convertendi sint Judaei, et pro eis oratio mirabili pietate depromitur.—*Exegesis*, p. 786, C.

Ps. 74. Vox Christi de judicio futuro.—Thorpe, p. 197.

Secundo [ingressu] Rex ipse loquitur Christus, justitiam se judicaturum promittens, cum tempus generalis resurrectionis advenierit.—*Exegesis*, p. 881.

Ps. 141. Vox Christi ad Deum.—Thorpe, p. 415.

Prima parte Dominus clamat ad Patrem.—*Exegesis*, p. 1095, B.

It will be remarked that the agreement here is only a general one, in no case extending to verbal expression.

On the other hand, leaving out Ps. 21, where the source of the divergent rubric is obvious, there is irreconcilable disagreement between rubric and *Explanatio* in the five remaining cases which follow.

Ps. 24. Vox David de adventu Christi.—Thorpe, p. 52.

Per totum psalmum deprecatur Ecclesia . . . —*Exegesis*, p. 604.

Ps. 45. Vox Apostoli in passione Christi.—Thorpe, p. 113.

This Psalm is set down in the *Explanatio* as spoken in the person partly of the "Filii Core, qui fideles debent intelligi Christiani," partly of the "credentium turba, generaliter ad divina miracula contuenda."—*Exegesis*, p. 724.

Ps. 113. Vox apostolica cum Judaeis, increpans idola.—Thorpe, p. 327.

Per totum psalmum propheta loquitur.—*Exegesis*, p. 1041.

Ps. 129. Canticum graduum. Vox Christi.—Thorpe, p. 387.

Clamat propheta ad Dominum.—*Exegesis*, p. 1091.

Ps. 142. Vox Christi ad Deum.—Thorpe, p. 417.

. . . . rogat [Propheta] Dominum Christum.—*Exegesis*, p. 1095.

A comparison with the interpretation laid down in the Commentary proper yields a result coincident with the above, and as I have been unable to identify these rubrics elsewhere, I am inclined to accept them as original with the transcriber himself.

With regard to the origin of the arguments or introductions in question, we have the opinion of Thorpe (*Præfatio*, vii) that they are “*partim ex scriptis Divi Hieronymi desumta, partim, ut videtur, ipsius interpretis ingenio excogitata.*” Again, in Wichmann’s article, we find the following statement on this subject (p. 49):

“Aus den überschritten mehrerer psalmen deren inhalt sich auf bestimmte Davidische verhältnisse nicht beziehen lässt, geht hervor dass der übersetzer dieselben ihrem inhalt gemäss formte, alles jedoch in einer art die eine benutzung irgend eines kommentars vollkommen ausschliesst.”

It will be evident, however, from the following that neither of the views expressed above is correct. We have, in fact, already been conducted to the true source of the Anglo-Saxon arguments. Those arguments, as I shall now proceed to set forth, are simply paraphrases of the same *argumenta* of the commentary, *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*, from which, as we have already seen, the Latin rubrics were borrowed. In the case of the Anglo-Saxon introductions, however, the *Explanationes* of the original are also frequently drawn on and the Vulgate (originally Septuagint) superscriptions which come between¹ *Argumenta* and *Explanationes* in *Exegesis* usually enter into the paraphrase, as well. As the latter—the *Explanationes*—invariably offer allegorical interpretations which, in many cases, recur in other commentaries, it is often difficult to determine when the relation of dependence is direct. Still, the examples to be cited later on show, I think, that these are to be reckoned among the sources.

In order that the comparison may be made as convenient as possible, I will reproduce below the Anglo-Saxon introductions, preceding each by the corresponding argument of

¹ I accept the order of the first edition of *Exegesis* (viz., that in the Basel edition of Bede’s works, 1563) as reflecting, no doubt, most accurately the order in the MSS. The same order is retained in all subsequent editions of the commentary till Migne’s reprint in which the Vulgate superscriptions are made to come first.

Exegesis, and Vulgate superscription or sentences of the *Explanatio*, where necessary, from which it was drawn. This reproduction, however, should be prefaced by an explanation of the method which the Anglo-Saxon translator has followed in paraphrasing his original. As the method is the same in all cases, the subject can best be illustrated by a specific example and I will select for the purpose Ps. 33, only omitting here the alternative mystical interpretation of the Latin commentary, as that is not used in the case of this psalm.

The Anglo-Saxon translator had before him in his original, first, the *argumentum*, then the Vulgate superscription for the psalm, as follows :

Argumentum.

Ezechias, victo Assyrio, semper Dominum benedicere promittit et angelum adiutorem sibi precatur immitti, moxque ad exemplum sui cunctos in Dei laudem provocat. . . .

Psalmus David cum mutavit vultum suum coram Abimelech et dimisit eum et abiit. *Exegesis*, p. 651.

Compare the corresponding Anglo-Saxon introduction :

Dauid sang þysne þreo and þrittigoðan sealm, gehatende Drihtne þæt he hine symle wolde bletsian, for þæm gifum þe he him geaf; and he wilnode on þæm sealm, þæt him God sende his godecundne engel on his fultum; and he lærde eac, on þæm sealm, ælcne man þe æfter him wære, þæt he þæt ylce dyde; and he witgode eac, on þæm sealm, be Ezechie þam kincge, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don æfter þam sige, þe he hæfde wið Assirium; and þæt ylce he witgode be Criste, þæt he þæt ylce don wolde, and eac oðre læran.

Thorpe, p. 74.

(1) The translator is instructed, then, by the Vulgate superscription that the psalm is a psalm of David's applied to circumstances of his own (David's) life. He finds in the *argumentum*, however, a totally different interpretation of the same psalm, connecting it with circumstances of the reign of King Hezekiah, whose prayer it is represented to be. The translator's reconciliation of these divergent interpretations is accomplished in a very simple and naïve, though somewhat

astonishing fashion. He sets aside the application of the Vulgate superscription and connects with David the circumstances which the argument had connected with Hezekiah. It was impossible to transfer to David's reign the events indicated in the words, *victo Assyrio*, so of this phrase alone no use is made in the interpretation of the psalm which the Anglo-Saxon offers as applying to King David.

(2) The connection of these circumstances with King Hezekiah which was found in the original argument appears, also, in the Anglo-Saxon, but simply in the form of the statement that David prophesied that the things which the translator has just arbitrarily connected with him would, also, be done by King Hezekiah ". . . and he witgode eac on þæm sealme, be Ezechie þam kincge, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don æfter þam sige þe he hæfde wið Assirium."

(3) This is not all, for we have immediately preceding this application to Hezekiah the statement that David, also, in this psalm instructed every one who should come after him to do the same things just mentioned that he had done—"and he lærde eac, on þæm sealme, ælcne man þe æfter him wære, þæt he þæt ylce dyde."

(4) Finally, he prophesied concerning Christ that he would do these things, also, and instruct others to the same effect,—“and þæt ylce he witgode be Criste, þæt he þæt ylce don wolde, and eac oðre læran."

It will be seen, then, from the above that the Anglo-Saxon interpretation of this psalm is arranged under a fourfold division.

In the case of the psalm just discussed, owing to the conflict of historical interpretations between the argument and the Vulgate superscription, the interpretation of the latter was set aside by the Anglo-Saxon translator. This conflict, fortunately, did not often arise in the first fifty psalms,—four times in all, Ps. 3, 5, 7, 50,—the Vulgate superscription usually appearing simply as "Psalmus David" without further detail which might have been opposed to the interpretation of the

argument. In the case of the first and third of the four psalms just cited, the authority of the Vulgate superscription was accepted in preference to that of the argument, and the historical applications of the latter do not appear in the Anglo-Saxon, while in the case of Ps. 5 and 50 the interpretations of the Vulgate superscriptions and the arguments were both exploited in the Anglo-Saxon introductions, in what manner we shall see.

It is still further to be remarked in connection with Ps. 33 that the second division of this introduction contained in the words, "he lærde eac, on þam sealme, ælene man þe æfter him wære, þæt he þæt ylce dyde," might appear to have been called forth, in the case of this particular psalm simply by the words of the Latin argument, "moxque ad exemplum sui cunctos in Dei laudem provocat." The impression, however, would be mistaken, for notwithstanding the correspondence pointed out which is, no doubt, genuine in this case, we have the same or similar formulas in all the psalms but Ps. 8, 18, 44, 49, though there is no suggestion of it in the original. Compare, for example, Anglo-Saxon introduction and Latin argument to Ps. 16 :

Deprecatur Dominum David ut se devotum cor habentem auditu dignum faciat quem inimici gratis impugnabant. Aliter Christus de Judaeis dicit ad Patrem. *Exegesis*, p. 561.

Dauid sang þysne syxteoþan sealme, and hine geornfullice gebæd on þisum sealme to Drihtne, and hine unscyldigne cyððe wið þa his fynd, þe his ehton, butan scylde; and swa doð ealle þa rihtwisan, þe þisne sealme singað, ymb þæt ylce hi hine singað; and swa dyde Crist be Judeum.

Thorpe, p. 30.

After having had the two examples above placed before us and the relation of the Anglo-Saxon to the original pointed out, we are now in a position to understand what is especially characteristic of the method of the Anglo-Saxon translator as applied to all cases. With the exception of Ps. 8, 18, 20, 44, 49, which will be considered later on, he interprets each of the

psalms under three, or, most frequently, under four different aspects reflected in corresponding divisions of the Anglo-Saxon introductions, the number being determined in each instance by the character of the Latin original. To take the commonest case—that of four divisions—to which the two psalms already cited belong, he interprets the psalm, first, with regard to its import when sung by David himself; second, when sung by any man (often good, righteous or Christian man); third, when sung by some designated sacred or historical personage of Jewish History (i. e., the sacred or historical personage to whose circumstances the psalm is applied in the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*. It is where this person is David himself, that the number of divisions in the Anglo-Saxon introductions sinks to three); fourth, when sung by Christ (omitted only in Ps. 8, 18, 44). The interpretation of the psalm with reference to David is usually simply repeated for the other characters,—as in the last-named examples, for instance,—by the formulas¹ *and swa dyde Ezechias*, and *swa dyde Crist*, etc. How the interpretation with reference to King David, in the first instance, has been everywhere obtained we have already seen above. It is simply the interpretation with reference to some definite historical personage which appears in the arguments of *Exegesis* transferred to King David, wherever such transference was necessary.

Besides the characters indicated above with regard to whom the psalms are regularly interpreted we have in a few instances the addition or substitution of other characters, viz., the apostles (Ps. 19, 22), Saint Paul (Ps. 50), any people—*ælc folc*—(Ps. 20). These additions or substitutions, occurring only five times in all, will be partly accounted for by the influence of the sections of the corresponding arguments in *Exegesis* devoted to mystical interpretation.

¹ The formula of repetition may appear in the modified form, viz., “and he (i. e., David) prophesied concerning any man (good, righteous or Christian) that he would do the same thing” (Ps. 24, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 37, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50),—or again, “and he instructed each man to do the same thing” (Ps. 33, 47).

To what, then, did the Anglo-Saxon translator owe the suggestion of his characteristic fourfold division?

First, with regard to the general idea of such a division, it should be remarked that we are not altogether at a loss for indications of something similar in the Latin commentaries themselves. When, with reference to Ps. 3, the author of the *Breviarium in Psalmos* says "Potest hic psalmus et ad David et ad Christum et per eum ad omnes sanctos pertinere" (Migne, XXVI, 827, C), we have precisely the divisions of our introductions in the case of psalms referred to David's reign by the arguments of *Exegesis*,—e. g., Ps. 16. Again in the *Breviarium* it is said of Ps. 4, "totus itaque psalmus ad Christum et per Christum ad justos referendus est" (id., p. 828, B).

But the accordance of the division with the usual ecclesiastical manner of interpreting the psalms will come out even more strongly, if we take up the four divisions separately, treating them for convenience' sake in a slightly transposed order from that which was used above.

(1) It is not surprising that every psalm should be interpreted first with reference to David, as we have seen, since it was the adopted teaching of the medieval church that all psalms were the psalms of David. In those cases where the traditional Septuagint title, passing over into the Vulgate, appeared to require a contrary opinion, the title was easily explained away. Thus, the author of *Exegesis* glosses the Vulgate title to Ps. 49, *Psalmus Asaph*, as follows:—"Nec ideo psalmus iste Asaph inscribitur quod ab ipso sit compositus, quia legitur et verum est David omnes psalmos composuisse, sed ideo sic intitulatur quia nominis hujus mysterium recte ei adaptatur," etc. (p. 740).

(2) But if every psalm, according to medieval doctrine, was a psalm of David, every psalm must, also, be interpreted with reference to Christ. Thus, in the Prologue to the *Breviarium in Psalmos*, the most widely read commentary on the Psalms of the Middle Ages, when it was erroneously accepted as the work of St. Jerome, we find the words: "Quamvis David

omnes psalmos cantasset, tamen omnes psalmi in persona Christi pertinent" (Migne, XXVI, 824).

For our present purpose, it is also worth noting that the psalms, especially the earlier ones, are frequently interpreted mystically as the utterances of Christ in the sections of the arguments of *Exegesis* devoted to that mode of interpretation which lay before the Anglo-Saxon translator. So, Ps. 2, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 27, 34, 40, 41.

(3) After the illustrations given above it will be needless to state again to what example it was due that the Psalms are likewise interpreted of still other sacred and historical personages. Except in the cases already mentioned of Ps. 3, 7, where the Vulgate titles conflicting with the arguments, preference was given to the former, the suggestion of these is due in every instance to the arguments of *Exegesis*. This will appear plainly, also, in the case of the psalms not yet cited, when the arguments and introductions are set side by side for comparison.

(4) We shall next seek for parallels to the division, observed in all psalms except Ps. 8, 18, 20, 44, 49, which offers a repetition of the interpretation of the psalm with reference to the circumstances of every man (often a good, benevolent, righteous, Christian man) who sings the psalm. This division was pointed out above as the third in the case of Ps. 33.

We have first to consider that in the mystical section of several of our arguments, viz., Ps. 8, 9, 19, 22, 29, 42, 48, psalms are often interpreted as utterances of the church, which is the congregation of all the righteous—"collectio fidelium sanctorum omnium" (Cassiodorus, Migne, LXX, 47, C). The number, however, of such psalms is small and it is unlikely that the translator has taken his suggestion from this quarter.

The example quoted above from the *Breviarium in Psalmos*, 827, C, sufficiently recognizes this line of interpretation, but we have in the Epistle of Athanasius to Marcellinus, quoted with approbation by Cassiodorus, an eloquent passage which seems to express aptly the sentiment in obedience to which the translator created this division of the Introductions.

“Quicumque Psalterii verba recitat, quasi propria verba decantat et tanquam a semetipso conscripta unus psallit, et non tanquam alio dicente, aut de alio significante sumit et legit; sed tanquam ipse de semetipso loquens, sic hujusmodi verba profert; et qualia sunt quæ dicuntur, talia velut ipse agens, ex semetipso loquens, Deo videtur offerre sermones” (Migne, LXX, 22).

Although it is, perhaps, impossible to point out a definite model for the fourth division of the Introductions, I think that the passages just quoted, together with certain others from *Exegesis* which I shall now quote, show that its adoption reflects unmistakably the spirit of ecclesiastical interpretation of the Psalms in the Middle Ages. In the commentary on the titles of the Psalms in this work, we often find a mystical interpretation of the psalm as the utterance of some faithful or perfect soul. The psalm may be conceived as spoken—Ps. 3—in persona scilicet alicujus membri ecclesiæ, id est, alicujus fidelis . . . (p. 500, C), as Ps. 4,—vox totius ecclesiæ aut . . . alicujus fidelis animæ (p. 501, A),—or again as spoken—Ps. 6—in voce alicujus fidelis animæ (p. 512, C). Ps. 7, attribuitur David vel cuicumque . . . perfectæ animæ (p. 516, D).—So for Ps. 12 (p. 551, A), Ps. 22 (p. 599, A), Ps. 25 (p. 609, A), Ps. 48 (p. 733, C).—Ps. 9 is composed by David,—in voce capitis vel etiam alicujus perfecti de priori populo (p. 530, C). Similarly, Ps. 8 (p. 525, A); Ps. 10, Hæc verba sequentia quæ psalmus sunt . . . attributa vel prophetæ ipsi vel alicui perfectiori (p. 544, B). So Ps. 11 (p. 547, C), Ps. 24 (p. 694, C), Ps. 35 (p. 666, D), Ps. 36 (p. 671, D), Ps. 38 (p. 687, A).—Ps. 42, David in finem, id est, talibus attribuitur iste psalmus qui pertinent ad finem, id est, ad Christum (p. 707, A). Compare with these passages, also, Præfatio Altera, p. 480, C.¹ With the above quotations, the special discussion of the fourth division is closed.

¹ I do not think it can be doubted that the Latin interpretations just cited, and the division of our translator which is under discussion spring from the same tradition of interpretation. That there is any closer connection than this, however, as I was once disposed to believe (*Modern Language*

An atmosphere of such ideas regarding the interpretation of the psalms as is revealed by the passages cited within the last few pages would make it easy for the translator to hit upon his peculiar division of the introductions. It seems most natural to assume, however, that the idea of division was directly suggested by the commentary which he had before him. In this work, as we have seen, the historical interpretation of the argument would come first,—next would come the mystical interpretation in which the notion of the psalm's being the voice of Christ, as has already been pointed out, often recurs, and lastly the Vulgate title ascribing the psalm to David. We have already, then, in the Commentary a threefold division which corresponds to that of the Anglo-Saxon introductions, except in the addition by the latter of still a fourth application of the interpretation noted above. As we have seen, the substance of the original divisions was not followed literally, of course, but modified in the manner and for the reasons already described.

Notes, VIII, 76 f.), I no longer regard as possible for the following reasons: (1) There is no other evidence, as we shall find, that the translator of the Paris Psalter used the commentary proper of *Exegesis*. This being the case, the above interpretations being embedded in that commentary appear too few and scattered to have suggested such a systematic division as that which we find in the Anglo-Saxon introductions. (2) If the division of the introductions under discussion were, indeed, suggested by the passages from *Exegesis* cited above, we should expect the expressions *ælc rihtwis man* (e. g., Ps. 9), *ealle þa rihtwisan* (e. g., Ps. 16), and their equivalents to occur from the beginning under the influence of the corresponding expressions, *alicujus fidelis* (e. g., Ps. 3), *perfecta anima* (e. g., Ps. 7), etc. As a matter of fact the paraphrast seems only to have felt his way to this fuller expression. We find the simple *swa deð ælc þæra [manna] þe bysne sealm singð* used in the introductions to Ps. 2, 3 (the introduction to Ps. 1 is wanting). In the case of Ps. 4, we have this expanded to *ælc welwillende mann*. There is, then, a recurrence to the simpler phrase until Ps. 9, when we have for the first time *ælc rihtwis mann*, corresponding to the *perfecta anima* above. From Ps. 9 on, this phrase or its equivalents prevail. (3) The above conception which appears with particular frequency in *Exegesis* is by no means absent from the other patristic commentaries, *Breviarium in Psalmos*, p. 849 (Ps. 12), p. 949 (Ps. 41), p. 951 (Ps. 42), p. 1177 (Ps. 114), p. 1207 (Ps. 121), p. 1210 (Ps. 125), p. 1214 (Ps. 129),—compare, also, St. Augustine, p. 98 (Ps. 7), and frequently Haymo.

Although the four (or three, as the case may be) regular divisions of the introductions are maintained throughout (except in the cases already noted of Ps. 8, 18, 44, 49), yet the order in which they occur is not always the same. In the great majority of instances, the interpretation is applied in the following order: (1) to David; (2) to the sacred or historical personage suggested by the corresponding argument of *Exegesis*; (3) to any man; (4) to Christ. As has been remarked, where the historical personage under (2) is David himself, the number of divisions sinks, of course, to three. Keeping this fact in mind, we have only the following variations from the above scheme to note:—Ps. 4, 5, 33, where (2) and (3) appear transposed;—Ps. 6, 9, 12, 13, where (2) is transferred to the end. In the case of Ps. 50 the interpretation with reference to Christ does not occur, and in Ps. 38 there is a recurrence to (1) at the end of the introduction.

The number of variations from the regular order, then, is, after all, insignificant, but the extent to which the divisions are expanded is very different in the case of the different psalms. In some instances, occurring, for the most part, after Ps. 25, the Anglo-Saxon paraphrast owes hardly more than the suggestion of his introduction to his original. The dependence, nevertheless, is everywhere unmistakable.

That the reader may be in a position to verify for himself the fact of this relation, I will now proceed to reproduce the Anglo-Saxon introductions in their due order, placing immediately before in each instance the corresponding argument of *Exegesis* from which it was drawn, and adding those passages of the *Explanationes* which seem, also, probably to have entered into the paraphrase. Similarly, to save space, I do not reproduce the Vulgate titles or the mystical sections of the arguments of *Exegesis*, except where they appear to have been used by the Anglo-Saxon translator or paraphrast. In making the intended comparison, what has been said about the paraphrast's method of procedure should be borne in mind. In connection with each psalm I shall add the observations

necessary in the particular case for explaining the relation of the Anglo-Saxon and its original which are not embraced in the general discussion just referred to.

Ps. 1.—(Anglo-Saxon introduction is wanting in the MS.)

Ps. 2.—Generalem David querimoniam facit ad Deum quod regno sibi desuper dato, et gentes et populi Israel inviderint, communem ad omnium correctionem dirigens. Aliter Christus de passione et potestate sua dicit. *Exegesis*, p. 489.

Ðæs æfteran sealmes capitul is geoweden Psalmus David, þæt is on Englisc, Dauides sealm; forþam he ys sealm geoweden, forþi he seofode on þæm sealme, and mænde to Drihtne be his feondum, ægðer ge inlendum ge utlendum, and be eallum his earfoðum; and swa deð ælc þæra þe þysne sealm singeð, be his sylfes feondum, and swa dyde Crist be Iudeum.

Thorpe, p. 2.

Ps. 3.—Psalmus David cum fugeret a facie Absalom filii sui (Vulgate title). Potest Ezechia convenire qui circumdatus Assyrio exercitu Dominum invocaverit. Aliter: vox Christi ad Patrem de Judæis (argument). David Christum accipe, Absalom Judam Iscariotem (explanatio).

Exegesis, p. 494.

Ðysne þridan sealm David sang þa he fleah Absolon his sunu, and seofode þa yrmðe to Drihtne: swa deþ ælc þæra manna þe þisne sealm singeð, his sylfes earfoðu, ægðer ge modes ge lichaman, he seofað to Drihtne; swa dyde Crist þonne he þysne sealm sang, be Iudeum he hine sang, and be Iudan Scarioth, þe hine læwde, he seofode to Drihtne.

Thorpe, p. 4.

The above is one of the two cases (Ps. 3, 7) where the Vulgate title has been preferred by the paraphrast to the argument.

Ps. 4.—In finem David canticum (Vulgate title). Ezechias contra æmulos suos de auxilio Domini gloriatur corripiens eosdem, ne in mendacio confidant: sed desinentes a malis cogitationibus semper Deo serviant. . . . Aliter, Arnobius exponit, quia Deus justitiæ exaudivit in cruce positum filium suum contra quem irascentes Judæi peccant usque hodie (argument) sed hæc (i. e., Psalmus et canticum) ideo videntur esse

sociata quia et instrumentis musicis et choris psallentium
consona vociferatione canebantur (explanatio).

Exegesis, p. 501.

þe feorða sealm ys gecweden Dauides sealm, and Dauides sang; forði ælc þæra sealma þe swa gecweden byð, þæt he sy ægðer ge Dauides sealm ge Dauides sancg, ælene ðæra he sancg be sone mid weorode: ac ða he þysne sealm sancg, þa gealp he and fægnode Godes fultumes wið his feondum; and swa deð ælc welwillende man, þe þisne sealm singð, and swa dyde Ezechias, þa he wæs ahred æt his feondum, and swa dyde Crist, ða he wæs ahred æt Iudeum.

Thorpe, p. 5.

Ps. 5.—In finem pro ea quæ hæreditatem consequitur, Psalmus David (Vulgate title). Ezechias post infirmitatem gratias agit Domino et adoratur in templo. Aliter vox Christi ad Patrem.

Exegesis, p. 506.

De fifta sealm ys gecweden Dauides sealm, ðone he sang be his sylfes frofre, and be herenesse ealra ðæra rihtwisena ðe secað yrfeweardnesse on heofonrice, mid Criste, se ys ende ealra ðinga: and ælc mann þe þisne sealm singð, he hine singð be his sylfes frofre; and swa dyde Ezechias, þa he alysed wæs of his mettrumnesse; and swa dyde Crist, þa he alysed wæs fram Iudeum.

Thorpe, p. 7.

It is to be observed that the Anglo-Saxon translator only follows the other patristic commentaries in interpreting *in finem* as referring to Christ (cf. St. Augustine, *Enarratio*, Migne, XXXVI, 83), and *ea* as referring to the Church (cf. *Breviarium in Psalmos*, Migne, XXVI, 829).

Ps. 6.—Ezechias infirmatus invocatur Dominum, causans fragilitatem humanæ naturæ. Aliter vox Christi ad Patrem. . . . Nota ordinem dispositionis mysticæ quia quinto psalmo mane hæreditas danda promittitur, in sexto resurrectio iudicii peritimescetur.

Exegesis, p. 511.

Dauid sang þysne syxtan sealm be his mettrumnesse, and be his earfoðum, and eac be þam ege þæs domes on domes dæge; and swa deð ælc þæra þe hine singð; and swa dyde Crist, þa he on eorðan wæs, he hine sang be his earfoðum; and eac Ezechias be his untrumnesse.

Thorpe, p. 9.

We have, of course, no memorable sickness recorded in the life of David as in that of Hezekiah, but the paraphrast carrying out his method in a perfectly mechanical way does not concern himself about the facts of history. In other instances (Ps. 28, 29, 31, 37, 40) when he connects with David psalms interpreted in the arguments of *Exegesis* as being occasioned by the famous sickness with which Hezekiah was visited by God for his pride (2 Chronicles, XXXII, 24–26), he endeavors to generalize the meaning of the Latin terms denoting illness, translating them by *earfoðu*, *ungelimp*, words which apply to all kinds of troubles, not simply bodily afflictions. Occasionally (Ps. 15, 27) we have the words *ægðer ge modes ge lichaman* added to modify *earfoðu*.

It was easier, as we shall see, to adapt to the circumstances of David those psalms which the arguments interpreted of the captives in Babylon (Ps. 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 30, 39, 41, 42), for David, not less than the Israelites of the captivity, did suffer exile during the persecution of Saul (1 Samuel, XIX–XXXI). In the case of Ps. 50 the difficulty of adaptation was avoided.

Least difficult of all to adapt to the life of a warrior like David were those which the arguments interpreted of the wars of Hezekiah (Ps. 4, 9, 12, 13, 19, 20, 28, 32, 33), of the two tribes (Ps. 45) and of the Macchabees (Ps. 43, 46).

In the case of Ps. 3, 7, as has been stated, the Vulgate titles and not the arguments were followed.

Ps. 7.—Psalmus David quem cantavit Domino pro verbis Chusi filii Jemini (Vulgate title). Ezechias ab hostibus calumniatus et a suis proditus Domino supplicat, imprecatus ejus judicium in eos qui mendaciter innocentem accusabant (argument). *Exegesis*, p. 515.

Þysne seofoðan sealm David sang, þa he seofode his ungelimp to Drihtne; þæt wæs þa Absolon his sunu hine adrifen hæfde of ðam rice, þa hine teone wyrde Chus Geniminis sunu; þa seofode he þæt to Drihtne, and swa deð ælc mann þe þysne sealm singð, mænð his earfoðu to Drihtne; and swa dyde Crist, þa he on eorðan wæs. Thorpe, p. 10.

This psalm constitutes the only instance besides Ps. 3 where the interpretation of the argument is set aside for that of the Vulgate title. The words: *þa hine teone wyrde Chus Genimins sunu* seem to show on the part of the paraphrast a confusion between Achithophel, the counsellor of Absalom, who did, indeed, hang himself from vexation when he saw that his counsel was not followed (2 Samuel, XVII, 23) and Hushai, the spy of King David (2 Samuel, XV–XVIII *passim*) at whose treacherous instigation that counsel was rejected.

Ps. 8.—Admiratur Propheta Dei potentiam, per quam gubernat cunctam mundi molem, gratiasque agit quod tantus creator hominis memoriam sit habere dignatus.

Exegesis, p. 524.

Þysne eahteoðan sealm sang Dauid, þa he wundrade Godes wundra, se wylt eallum gesceaftum; and eac he witgode on ðam sealme be þære wulderlican acennednesse Cristes.

Thorpe, p. 13.

The last clause of the Anglo-Saxon introduction just given would seem, at first sight, to have nothing corresponding in the Latin argument. I think, however, that it simply embodies an interpretation of the words, *gratiasque quod tantus creator hominis memoriam sit habere dignatus*, as referring to the Incarnation of Christ wherein the creator showed himself most mindful of man.

Ps. 9.—Orat Dominum David pro dolosis cogitationibus filii sui gratias agens quod eas non sequeretur effectus. Potest et Ezechiae congruere gratias agenti post Assyrii exercitus interitum. . . .

Exegesis, p. 529.

On ðam nigoðan sealme Dauid hine gebæd to Drihtne, and him þancode, þæt his sunu and eac oðre fynd him ne mihton eall þæt yfel don, ðæt hi him geteohod hæfdon; and on þa ylcan gerad, hine singð ælc rihtwis mann be his sylfes feondum; and be þam ylcan, hine sang Crist, þa Iudeas hine woldan don mare yfel ðonne hig mihton; and swa dyde eac Ezechias, ða his fynd hine ne meahhton ateon swa hy woldon.

Thorpe, p. 14.

Ps. 10.—Verba David quando Saulem fugiens in desertis est habitare compulsus. Aliter vox Christi est. . . .

Exegesis, p. 544.

Dysne teopan sealm Daid sang, þa he wæs adriften on þæt westen fram Sawle þam cyng, þa his geferan hine lærdon þæt he hine þær hydde, swa þes spearuwa; and swa ylce þa rihtwisan þe hine singað hi seofiað be heora feondum, ægðer ge gesewenlicum ge ungesewenlicum; and swa dyde Crist be Iudeum, þa he þysne sealm sang. Thorpe, p. 20.

The clause, þa his geferan . . . swa þes spearuwa, is taken from the first verse of the psalm,—Quomodo dicitis animæ meæ, Transmigre in montem, sicut passer? Compare the Anglo-Saxon translation,—Hwy lære me þæt ic fleo geond muntas and geond westenu, swa spearwa?

Ps. 11.—Ex persona David canitur quod in tempore ejus omnis defecerit sanctus et diminutæ sint veritates a filiis hominum. Aliter, Christus pro passione suorum dicit de Judæis.

Exegesis, p. 547.

Ða Daid þisne endleftan sealm sang, þa seofode he on þam sealme, þæt on his dagum sceolde rihtwisnes and wisdom beon swa swiðe alegen; and swa deð ælc rihtwis mann, þonne he þysne sealm singð, þonne mænð he to Drihtne þæt unriht þæt on his dagum bið; and swa dyde Crist þa he hine sang, þa mænde he to Drihtne Iudea ungeleaffulnesse.

Thorpe, p. 22.

Ps. 12.—Ezechia preces ab Assyriis obsessi. Aliter vox Christi ad Patrem de diabolo dicit in Marco.

Exegesis, p. 550.

Ða Daid þysne twelftan sealm sang, þa seofode he to Drihtne on þam sealme be his feondum, ægþer ge gastlicum ge lichamlicum; and swa deð ælc þæra þe hine singð; and swa dyde Crist be Iudeum and be deoflum; and swa dyde Ezechias se cyng be Assiriam, þa hi hine ymbseten hæfdon on þære byrig.

Thorpe, p. 23.

Ps. 13.—. . . Hæc Ezechias contra Rapsacen loquitur. Item verba Christi ad divitem se interrogantem in Matthæo et de populo Judaico.

Exegesis, p. 552.

Ða Daid þisne þreotteoðan sealm sang, þa seofode he to Drihtne on þam sealme, þæt æfre on his dagum sceolde gewurðan swa lytle treowa, and swa lytel wisdom wære on worulde; and swa deð ælc rihtwis man, þe hine nu singð, he seofað þæt ylce be his tidum; and swa dyde Crist be Iudeum, and Ezechias be Rapsace, Assiria cyninge. Thorpe, p. 24.

In the clause, þæt æfre . . . treowa, there is obvious reference to the first verse of the psalm,—*Dixit insipiens in corde suo, Non est Deus. Corrupti sunt et abominabiles facti sunt in voluntatibus suis.*

The paraphrast is mistaken in calling Rab-shakeh, king of Assyria. He was only one of the king's generals; cf. 2 Kings, XVIII, 17–37.

Ps. 14.—*Verba populi in captivitate Babylonie optantis reditum ad patriam, enumerantisque quibus meritis quis ad hanc pervenire queat. . . .* *Exegesis*, p. 556.

Daid sang þysne feowerteoðan sealm, þa he adrifene wæs of his earde, wisete þæt he moste eft to cuman; and swa dyde Israela folc, þa hie on hæftnyde gelædde wæron, of Hierusalem to Babilonia; and swa deð ælc rihtwis man, þonne he þysne sealm singð, wilnað him sumere rothwile on þissere worulde, and ec reste æfter þisum; and swa dyde Crist, þa he hine sang, seofode his earfoðum to Drihtne. Thorpe, p. 27.

Ps. 15.—*Ezechias in ægritudine Dominum deprecatur et in vitæ suæ reparatione gratulatur et quod humanarum rerum non sit egens exponitur. Item vox Christi ad Patrem.* *Exegesis*, p. 557.

Þone fiteoðan sealm Daid sang be his earfoðum, ægðer ge modes ge lichaman; and eft swa ilce Ezechias hine sang be his mettrumnesse, wilnode him to Gode sumre frofre; and swa deð ælc rihtwis mann, þe hine singð, on his earfoðum; and swa dyde Crist, þa he hine sang. Thorpe, p. 28.

The words, wilnode . . . frofre, are not so much a paraphrase of “in vitæ suæ reparatione gratulatur” as a continuation of the paraphrase of the preceding clause.

Ps. 16.—(See above.)

Ps. 17.—In finem puero domini David, qui locutus est Domino verba cantici hujus in die qua eripuit eum Dominus de manu omnium inimicorum ejus et de manu Saul et dixit (Vulgate title). Hunc Psalmum David prope ultimum vitæ suæ tempus, ut ipse titulus indicat, pro gratiarum actione cantavit . . . (argument). *Exegesis*, p. 566.

Dauid sang þysne seofonteoþan sealm lytle ær his ende, ymb swyðe lang þæs þe hine God alysed hæfde, ægðer ge æt Sawle ge æt eallum his feondum; and swa deð ælc þæra þe hine singð, ðancað Gode his mundbyrde, þonne he hine of hwylcum earfoðum alysed hæfð, oþþe hine oððe þæne þe he hine fore singð, for þæm ylcan hine sang Crist, þonne he alysed wæs fram Iudea eltnesse. Thorpe, p. 33.

It is curious that the paraphrast should have made use of the phraseology of the Vulgate title and yet have deviated from its interpretation as regards the time when this psalm was composed, preferring to follow the argument.

Ps. 18.—Approbatur in hoc psalmo providentia Dei, qui ex hoc ipso multam hominum curam se habere monstravit, cum ita elementa a se creata componit ut post ipsa possit cognosci. *Exegesis*, p. 579.

Þysne eahtateoðan sealm Dafid sang, Gode to ðancunga his mislicra and manigfealdra gesceafta ðe he gesceop, mannum to ðeowian; ne forðy þæt þa men sceoldon him ðeowian; be þæm he cwæð. Thorpe, p. 40.

The relation of dependence here is very slight, which is due, no doubt, to the obscurity of the Latin. It appears to mean, "God has shown his concern for men by revealing himself in his works that they might know him."

Ps. 19.—Pro Ezechia rege suo populus pariter ab Assyriis obsessus orat. . . Item Christo eunti ad crucem dicit Ecclesia, ut Arnobio placet. *Exegesis*, p. 584.

Dauid sang ðysne nigonteoðan sealm, and sæde on ðæm sealme hu his folc him fore gebæde on his earfoðum; and eac Ezechias folc gebæd for hine, þa he wæs beseten mid his feondum on þære byrig; and swa doð ealle cristene men be þysne sealm singað, hy hine singað for heora kyningas;

and eac þa apostolas hine sungon be Criste, þa hine man
lædde to rode. Thorpe, p. 42.

The paraphrast substitutes *þa apostolas* for *Ecclesia*. The Latin rubric repeats the latter.

Ps. 20.—De Ezechia canitur, cæsis Assyriis, et infirmitate curata. *Exegesis*, p. 587.

Ðysne twentigoðan sealm David sang be him sylfum, and eac witegode be Ezechie ðam kinge; and ælc folc ðe hine singð for heora kyning, and ealra mæst David witegode on ðæm sealme be Criste. Thorpe, p. 43.

The emphasis of the last clause may be explained by a reference to the *Explanatio*. “Hic psalmus Domini Salvatoris primo Incarnationem, et postea deitatis facta decantat, ut patenter agnoscas eumdem tam Virginis matris, quam Dei Patris esse Filium.”

Ps. 21.—(Wanting.)

Ps. 22.—Reditum populi de Babylone prædicat, enumerans quantis redeuntes in itinere solatiis usi sunt Dei, quanta post reversionem rerum ubertate donati. Item vox Ecclesiæ post baptismum ad Esther. Aliter quia in vigesimo primo psalmo habuimus tribulationem passionis, in vigesimo secundo lætitiæ resurrectionis accepimus (argument). Loquitur per totum psalmum renatus in baptismo Christianus . . . (explanatio). *Exegesis*, p. 598 f.

David sang þysne twa and twenteogepan sealm þa he witegode be Israela folces freodome; hu hy sceoldon beon alæd of Babilonia þeowdome, and hu hi sceoldon Gode ðancian þæra ara þe hi be wege hæfdon hamweardes; and eac be his agenre gehwyrftnesse of his wræcsiðe; and ælc þæra ðe hine singð, he ðancað Gode his alysnesse of his earfoðum; and swa dydon þa Apostolas, and eall þæt cristene folc, Cristes æriste; and eac ðanciað cristene men, on þyson sealme, heora alysnesse of heora scyldum æfter fulluhte. Thorpe, p. 49.

Ps. 23.—Psalmus David prima Sabbati (Vulgate title). Prædicatur populo, imo præcipitur quibus vitæ suffragiis valeat de captivitate Babylonica laxari (argument). Prima Sabbati significat diem Dominicam quæ prima est post Sab-

batum, quo die Dominus resurrexit a mortuis . . . (explanation).
Exegesis, p. 600 f.

On þissum þreo and twentigoðan sealme, Daid witegode and rehte mid hwylcum geeaunungum gehwyle man hine mæg alysan of his earfoðum; and eac he witegode be Cristes sigefæstnesse, þa he on heofonas astah, æfter his æriste; and eac he witgode be him sylfum, hu his ealdormenn sceoldon fægrian his cymes of his wræcsiðe. Thorpe, p. 50.

It is singular that the historical interpretation of the argument should here be omitted from the Anglo-Saxon introduction, although the words in which it is laid down are used for another purpose.

Ps. 24.—Ex persona populi in Babylone degentis oratio formatur.
Exegesis, p. 604.

Daid sang þysne feower and twentigoðan sealm, and hine þæron gebæd, þa he to þære reste becom, þe he ær wilnode; and eac he witegode on þam sealme be þæs folces gehwyrfnesse of heora hæftnyde, þa hi on Babilonia gehæfte wæron; and swa ylce bi ælcum rihtwisum, þonne he ænige reste hæfð, æfter his earfoðum; and eac be Criste, be his æriste.

Thorpe, p. 52.

The interpretation of this psalm in the Anglo-Saxon with reference to Christ's resurrection is probably repeated from the preceding introduction. It is not found in the Latin argument to Ps. 24.

Ps. 25.—Ex persona captivorum in Babylone verum sanctorum prophetiæ carmen componitur qui pro conscientiæ bono captivitatis resolutionem confidentius postularent. Aliter propheta de se testatur.
Exegesis, p. 608 f.

Daid sang þisne fif and twentigoðan sealm be his unscyldignesse wið his sunu, and wið his geþeahteras, þe hine on woh lærdan: and eac he witgode on þam sealme, be þære unscyldignesse Israela folces wið Assirie, þa hi hy læddan on hæftnyd to Babilonia; and eac swa ylce, ælc rihtwis man þe hine singð, he hine singð be him sylfum, and be þam þe hine unscyldigne dreccað; and swa dyde eac Crist be Iudeum.

Thorpe, p. 55.

The phraseology of the Anglo-Saxon introduction here has been determined in some measure by the words of the first verse of the psalm—Judica me, Domine, quoniam ego in innocentia mea ingressus sum. Cf. the Anglo-Saxon translation: Dem me, Drihten, forþam ic eom unscyldig wið þas mine fynd.

Ps. 26.—(Wanting.)

Ps. 27.—Ezechias infirmitatis suæ tempore Dominum rogat Christus de Judæis dicit ad Patrem.

Exegesis, p. 619.

Dauid sang þisne seofon and twentigoþan sealm; on þæm sealme he wæs cleopiende to Drihtne, wilnode þæt he hine arette, and gefriðode wiþ eallum earfoðum, ægðer ge modes ge lichaman; and wið ealle his fynd gescylde, ge wið gese-wene ge wið ungesewene: and eac Ezechias, on þam ylcan sealme, hine gebæd, þæt hine God alysdæ, ægðer ge æt his mettrumnesse ge æt his feondum, swa he þa dyde; and þæs ylcan wilnað ælc þe hine singð, oþþe for hine sylfne, oððe for oþerne; and swa ylce dyde Crist, þa þa he þysne sealm sang.

Thorpe, p. 59.

Ps. 28.—Exhortatio Ezechiae, qua ab Assyriis et morte liberatus usurus sit ad Judæos, ut pro tantis beneficiis Deo gratiarum actio et vota reddantur. . . . *Exegesis*, p. 622.

Ðysne eahta and twentigoðan sealm Dauid sang, bebeodende þam folce þæt hi gelæston heora gehat, and heora ælmessan sealdon Gode, for swa myelum gifum swa he him geaf; and he witegode eac þæt ylce be Ezechie, þe lange æfter him wæs, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don, þonne he alysdæ wære æt Asirium, and eac æt his mettrumnesse; and eac swa ilce he witegode be eallum þam þe æfter him gebrocode wæron, and eft arette, þæt hi eac þæs Gode ðancodon, æfter heora bysne; and eac he witegode be Criste, þæt he sceolde beon alysd æt Iudeum: he cwæð.

Thorpe, p. 61.

Ps. 29.—Psalmus cantici in dedicatione domus David (Vulgate title). Elevatus Ezechias victoriæ tam gloriosæ proventu, ægrotatione correptus est, ut suæ fragilitatis admonitione deponeret arrogantiam: sub ejus proinde persona ab errore correpti, ab infirmitate salvati, et ab hostibus eruti gratiarum

actio prædicatur, et pro conversatione templi, tanquam pro dedicatione decantatur . . . (argument). . . . Domus autem David Dominici corporis in templum, dedicatio vero ejus resurrectionem ejus ostendit, qua in æternam gloriam potestatemque perductum est (explanatio). *Exegesis*, p. 625.

Dauid sang þysne nigan and twentigopān sealm þam Gode, þe hine alysd eæt his feondum, and eæt eallum earfoðum; and þæt ylce he witegode be Ezechie, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don þonne he alysed wære eæt Assirium, and eæt his mettrumnesse; and þæt ylce he witegode be ælcum rihtwisan men, þe þysne sealm singð, oþþe for hine sylfne, oþþe for oðerne, Gode to ðancunge þære blisse, þe he þonne hæfð; and eac he witegode on þam sealne be Criste, hu he sceolde alysed beon, ægðer ge fram Iudeum ge of ðy deaðe. Thorpe, p. 63.

Ps. 30.—Quibus verbis pro reditu suo plebs in Babylone captiva Deo supplicet, quæve mala pertulerit, et quæ futura sit, Deo concedente, reuersio, prædicatur . . . (argument). . . . pertinens ad Dominum Christum, de cujus passione et resurrectione totus est psalmus cantatus (explanatio). *Exegesis*, p. 629.

Dauid sang þysne ðrittigoðan sealm, gebiddende to Drihtne for his hamcyme of ðam wræce, and of þam earfoðan, þa he þa on wæs; and eac he witgode be þære wræce, þe æfter him wurðan sceolde þam folce; þæt wæs þa hi to Babilonia gelædde wæron: he witgode, þæt hi sceoldon gebiddan on þa ylcan wisan þe he dyde, and hyra ungelimp ðær seofian swa he dyde; and eac he witegode be ælcum rihtwisan menn, þe sealmas singð, awþer oþþe for hine sylfne, oððe for oðerne mann, þara þe geswenced byð, awðer oþþe on mode, oþþe on lichaman; and he witegode eac be Criste, þæt he hine sceolde swa gebiddan wið þam earfoðum, þe Iudeas him dydon. Thorpe, p. 65.

Ps. 31.—Oratio Ezechiae quia in languorem ob superbiam inciderit; convenit et cæteris sanctis simili statu degentibus. *Exegesis*, p. 641.

Dauid sang þisne an and ðrittigoðan sealm wundriende þære unasecgendlican gesælignesse þæra manna, þe him God forgifð ealle heora scylda, and him ælc geswinc aferþ, swa swa he him oft dyde; and he witgode eac be Ezechie, hu he sceolde wundrian þære myclan mildheortnesse, þe he him oft

forgeaf, ægðer ge on his hælo ge on his alysnesse æt his feondum ; and swa ylce he witgode be ælcum godum men, þe him God swa ymb dyde ; and he ætwat eac him sylfum, þæt he ne hreowsode his synna, ær he hæfde witnunga : and he witgode eac be Criste, þæt he swa ylce wolde herian swylce menn.

Thorpe, p. 69.

This is one of the seven penitential psalms, and the Anglo-Saxon introduction expands the interpretation of the arguments to suit that character. The expansion is quite in accord with the interpretation of *Explanatio*, but I can discover no verbal agreement. The first clause of the paraphrase shows evidently the influence of the first verse of the psalm—*Beati quorum remissæ sunt iniquitates et quorum tecta sunt peccata*.

Ps. 32.—*Post victoriam de Assyriis carmen triumphale componitur in quo docetur irritæ spei esse omnia quibus præter Deum mortales exsultant.* *Exegesis*, p. 615.

Dauid sang þisne twa and ðrittigofan sealm, herigende Drihten, and him ðanciende, þæt he hine swa wunderlice of eallum his earfofum gefriðode, and hine swa weorðlice gesette ofer his rice ; and eac he lærde, on þam sealme, ealle menn, þæt hi sceolden Gode ðancian, ealra þæra gooda þe he him dyde ; and he witgode eac be Ezechie, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don, þonne he alysed wære of his earfoðum, and be ælcum þæra þe þysne sealm singð ; and eac be Criste he witgode, þæt he sceolde, æfter his æriste, ealle men þæt ylce læran.

Thorpe, p. 71.

Ps. 33.—(See above.)

Ps. 34.—*Occasione ærumnarum suarum David hunc psalmum in tempore Jeremieae componit, quæque pertulerit qualiterve oraverit, exponit. Aliter totus psalmus ex persona Christi est et per Christum ad omnes sanctos referri potest.*

Exegesis, p. 658.

Dauid sang þysne feower and ðrittigofan sealm, siofigende to Drihtne his yrmða ; tealde his ungelimp, and hu he hine gebæd to Gode, þæt he him gearode ; and eac he witegode, on þam ylcan sealme, þæt ylce be ælcum rihtwisan menn, þe þysne sealm sunge, oððe for hine sylfne oþþe for oðerne mann, þæt he sceolde þæs ylcan wilnian ; eac he witgode be Criste þæt he

wolde þæt ylce don, þonne he come, ma witgiende, þonne
wyrgende oððe wilniende. Thorpe, p. 77.

The words "in tempore Jeremiae" in connection with David probably puzzled the Anglo-Saxon paraphrast, and so were, no doubt, purposely omitted.

The final phrase, "ma witgiende þonne wyrgende oððe wilniende," might seem to have been drawn from the commentary proper of *Exegesis*, with reference to this psalm, p. 659. A : "Loquitur autem hic caput nostrum primum pro se dicens, non malevolentia optandi, sed præscientia prophetandi." This has always been the method, however, by which the Church has explained away the Imprecatory Psalms ; cf. *Breviarium in Psalmos* (to Ps. 11, verse 3) : Numquid maledicendo dicit? Non : quia non est mos sanctorum maledicere, sed pronuntiando quod futurum est, dixit : non optando, et sed prophetando (Migne, XXVI, 847, C); or Gregory, *Cura Pastoralis* (Migne, LXXVII, 15, B), where the words of the Psalmist in a similar passage are interpreted as spoken, "non optantis animo sed prophetantis ministerio." King Aelfred's translation of the passage runs : "Ne cwæð he ðæt for ðy ðe he ænegum men ðæs wyscte or wilnode, ac he witgode swa swa hit geworðan sceolde" (Sweet's edition, p. 29). The above line of interpretation is not wholly out of favor even at the present day : cf. Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible* (American edition), III, 2626. It may be well to add to the above references a passage in St. Augustine's *Enarrationes* (Migne, XXXVI, 88).

Ps. 35.—Cum Saulis insidiis urgeretur, hunc psalmum cecinit eo præcipue tempore cum eum necare volens, scyphum tantum pro signo fidei, hastamque proripuit.

Exegesis, p. 666.

Dauid sang þysne fif and ðrittigoðan sealm, þa he wæs aflymed fram Sawle, on þa ylcan tiid þe he genam his ceac, and his spere, on his getelde, on niht, to tacne þæt he inne mid him slæpendum wæs ; and swa deð ælc þæra þe þysne sealm singð, for his earfoðum ; and swa dyde Crist, þa he hine sang, for ðam earfoðum þe Iudeas him dydon.

Thorpe, p. 82.

Ps. 36.—Aedificatur hoc psalmo fides eorum, qui, pravorum temporali felicitate turbati, suas virtutes intermittunt.

Exegesis, p. 671.

Dauid sang þysne syx and ðritigoðan sealm, on þæm he lærde ealle geleaffulle þæt hy ne onhyredon þam yfelwillendum, þeah him þuhte þæt he gesælige and orsorge wæron; forþam hyra orsorgnes swiðe hraðe aspringð; and ælc þæra ðe gyt þysne sealm singð, be þam ylcan he hine singð; and eac Crist þæt ylce lærde and witgode, þonne he ðysne sealm sang.

Thorpe, p. 84.

The paraphrast has, also, made use of the first verse of the psalm in framing this introduction; cf. *noli æmulari inter malignantes, neque emulatus fueris facientes iniquitatem*; and the Anglo-Saxon translation of the same:—*Ne wundrie ge þæra yfelwillendra, and þæra orsorgra, ne him na ne onhyriað; ne eow ne ofðince þeah eow ne sy swa swa him, þa þe unriht wyrcað*;—*yfelwillende* corresponds more exactly to *malignans* than to *pravus* of the argument. The phraseology, in other respects, is identical.

Ps. 37.—Ezechias ægrotans Domino supplicat. . . .

Exegesis, p. 679.

Dauid sang þysne seofon and ðrittigoðan, andettende Drihtne his scylde, and seofigende his ungelimp, þæt he ær mid his scyldum gearnode; and he eac healsode Drihten, on þæm searme, þæt he hine on swylcum earfeðum ne lete his lif geendian; and he witegode eac be Ezechie, þam kynce, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don, on his earfoðum; and eac be ælcum þæra ðe ðysne sealm sunge, oþþe for hine sylfne, oððe for oðerne man, he witegode þæt he sceolde þæt ilce mænan, and eac þæt ylce gemetan; and eac be Criste he witegode þæt he wolde þæt ylce don.

Thorpe, p. 89.

Ps. 38.—*Angentibus sub Saule mæroribus, hunc psalmum cecinit, qui plus exhortationis pro audientium profectu quam pro se deprecationis haberet. Aliter propheta increpat eos qui divitias habent et nesciunt cui dimittant eas.*

Exegesis, p. 686.

Dauid sang þysne eahta and ðrittigoðan sealm, seofigende to Drihtne, mid hu manegum unrotnessum he wæs ofðrycæd

under Sawle. On þam sealme he lærde and tælde ealle men, þe worulde welan gaderiað mid unrihte, and nytan hwam hi hine læfað; and eac he witgode þæt ælc þæra þæt ylce don sceolde, þe þysne sealm æfter him sunge; and eac he witgode be Criste, þæt he wolde seofian swa ylce his nearonesse, þe he hæfde under Iudeum; and eac on æfterweardum þam sealme, he wilnode ealra swiðost, þæt him God sealde sume frofre, and sume rothwile on þys andweardum life, ær his ende.

Thorpe, p. 92.

In the last clause of the above Anglo-Saxon paraphrase use is made of the final verse of the psalm, v. 16. Cf. Remitte mihi, ut refrigerer, prius quam eam, et amplius non ero: Forlæt me nu, Drihten, to sumre rothwile on ðisse weorulde, ær ic hire swa ofgewite, þæt ic eft ne sy.

Ps. 39.—*Populus de Babylone reversus Domino gratias agit. Aliter qui in trigesimo octavo psalmo dixit: Quæ est expectatio mea, nonne Deus? nunc in trigesimo nono dicit: Expectans expectavi Dominum et respexit me . . . (argument) . . . Ob hoc Patris auxilium deprecatur [Christus], ut pericula possit a Judæis illata devincere, confundi postulans inimicos, et lætari omnes qui sperant in eum (explanatio).*

Exegesis, p. 692.

Dauid sang þysne nigan and ðritigoðan sealm, gylpende on þam sealme, þæt he nauht idel nære, þa he anbidode Godes fultumes; forþam he on ðæm ærran sealme ahsode God, Hwæt his anbid wære? oððe hwæs he anbidode? And eac he witgode be þam gehæftan folce on Babylonia, þæt hy sceoldon þone ylcan sealm singan, and þæt ylce seofian, and eft fæg-nian, þonne hy on genere wæron, and þysne sealm singan, swa he dyde; and swa ylce gebyreð ælcum cristnum men, þas twegen sealmas to singanne; þone ærran on his earfoðum, and þone æftran, syþþan he genered byð; and þæt ylce he witgode be Criste, þæt he wolde, be þam ylcan, þas sealmas singan, ægðer ge be þam earfoðum, ðe hine Iudeas dydon, ge eft be his alysnesse.

Thorpe, p. 95.

Ps. 40.—*Infirmis et curatio prædicatur Ezechiae, et quod occasione languoris latentes inimici detecti sunt insultando, quodque ipsa ægrotatio in devotionem ejus profecerit. Item vox Christi de passione sua et de Juda traditore.*

Exegesis, p. 698.

Dauid sang þysne feowertigoðan sealm be his earfoðum, and eft be þam fultume þe he hæfde fram Gode; and he sæde eac on þam sealm, hu he hæfde afandod ægðer ge his frynd ge his fynd, on his earfoðum, and on his ungelimpe; and eac he witgode be Ezechie cinge, þe æfter him beon sceolde, þæt him sceolde þæt ylce beon; and eac be ælcum cristnum men he witgode þæt ylce, þara þe ærest on earfoðum byð, and eft on eðnesse; and eac be Criste he witgode, on þæm sealm, and be Iudeum, hu hy hine swencton, and hu hine God eft arette.

Thorpe, p. 99.

Ps. 41.—*Populus in Babylone captivus patriæ memor orat. Aliter ante baptismum vox Christi ad eos qui fidem sunt consecuturi. . . .*

Exegesis, p. 701.

Dauid sang þysne an and feowertigoðan sealm, þa he wilnode to hys eðle to cumanne, of his wræcsiðe; and þæt ilce he witgode be Israela folce, gehæftum on Babilonia, þæt hy sceoldon þæt ylce don; and eac he witgode be ælcum cristnum men, þara geswenced, oþþe on mode oððe on lichaman, and þonne wilnode ægðer ge þyses lifes frofre ge þæs toweardan; and eac be Criste and be Iudeum he witgode, hu he wilnode þæt he wurde gedæled wið hy and wið heora yfelnesse.

Thorpe, p. 101.

Ps. 42.—*Populus ut supra (that is, same interpretation as for preceding psalm.—Argument). . . . Psalmus iste cuique fidelium congruit qui in primo capite Dominum deprecatur, ut in adventu novissimi examinis ab infidelium consortio liberetur (explanatio).*

Exegesis, p. 706 f.

Dauid sang þysne tu and feowertigoðan sealm, and healsode God on ðyssum sealm, þæt he demde betwuh him and his feondum, þe nane æ Godes ne heoldon, and he eac witgode be þam gehæftan folce on Babylonia, þæt hy sceoldon þæt ylce don; and be ælcum cristnum menn, þe þysne sealm singð, he witgode, þæt hy hine sceoldon be þam ylean singan; and eac Crist be Iudeum.

Thorpe, p. 104.

The paraphrast uses also the first verse of the psalm—*Judica me Deus, et discerne causam meam de gente non sancta; ab homine iniquo et doloso eripe me: Dem me, Dryhten, and do sum toscead betwuh me and unrihtwisum folce, and from facenfullum menn, and unrihtwisum, gefriða me.*

Ps. 43.—Machabæorum pressuras propheta supplicationes-
que commemorat. . . . *Exegesis*, p. 709.

Dauid sang þysne ðreo and feowertigoðan sealme seofigende his earfopa, and myndgode þæra gyfa, þe he his fædrum and his foregengum sealde, and hiora eaforum gehet; and eac seofode þæt him ðuhte þæt hy God, on ðam tidum, swa hrædlice ne gehyrde, swa he his foregengan dyde; and eac he witgode on þam sealme be Mathathia, and be his sunum, þa we Machabeas hatað, þæt hy sceoldon þæt ylce seofian on hiora earfoðum, under Antiochus, þam kynge; and eac he witgode be ælcum cristnum men, þe to Gode hopað, þæt he sceolde þæt ylce don; and eac be Criste, þæt he wolde þæt ylce don be Iudeum. Thorpe, p. 105.

In the composition of the above introduction independent use has evidently been made of the psalm itself, apart from the interpretation of the arguments. The hints there given are expanded from the first Book of Maccabees. For Mattathias and his sons, cf. 1 Maccabees, II, 27.

Ps. 44.—Propheta de Christo ad ecclesiam dicit . . . (argument). . . . Cœlestibus epulis propheta saginatus præconia se Dominicæ Incarnationis eructare promittit . . . (explanatio). *Exegesis*, p. 714.

Dauid witgode on þisum feower and feowertigoþan sealme, þa he wæs oferdrenct mid þy halgan gaste; and on eallum þam sealme he spræc ymb Fæder, and ymb Sunu, and ymb þa halgan gesamnuncga cristenra manna, geond ealle eorðan. Sona on þam forman ferse, se Fæder spræc, ðurh Dauid, be Cristes acennesse (sic), and cwæð. Thorpe, p. 109.

This is one of the messianic psalms according to the universal interpretation of the Middle Ages, with which the argument in *Exegesis* agrees. It was regarded as a sort of nuptial hymn, celebrating the mystic marriage of Christ and Holy Church; cf. St. Augustine, *Enarratio in Psalmum XLIV* (Migne, XXXVI, p. 493): "Cantatur enim de sanctis nuptiis, de sponso et sponsa, de rege et plebe, de salvatore et de his qui salvandi sunt," explaining later on (p. 494): "Etenim sponsa Ecclesia est, sponsus Christus." He inter-

prets the first three verses as the words of the Father. The Anglo-Saxon paraphrast, then, receives simply the suggestion of what the interpretation should be from the argument and *Explanatio* of *Exegesis*, expanding according to the general tradition, exemplified by the words of St. Augustine quoted above. The same tradition has suggested the numerous allegorical interpretations with which the translation of the text of the psalm itself has been interpolated.

Ps. 45.—Ex persona canitur duarum tribuum, pro liberatione sua gratias agentium, quando Phaceas filius Romeliæ et Rasin rex Syriæ Achas regem et Jerosolyma volentes expugnare, non valuerunt sed ipsi potius sunt ab Assyriorum rege conquassati. . . .

Exegesis, p. 724.

Dauid sang þysne fif and feowertigopān sealm, ðanciende Gode þæt he hine oft alysde of manegum earfoðum; and eac he witgode þæt þæt ylce sceoldon don þa men, þa þe twa scira (þæt ys Iude and Beniamin), þæt hy sceoldon þam Gode ðancian, þe hy gefriðode fram þære ymbsetennesse, and fram þære herunge þara twega kynningga, Sacces, Rumeles suna, and Rassess, Syria cyneges; næs þæt na gedon for þæs cyningges geearnunga Achats, ac for Godes mildheortnesse, and for his yldrena gewyrhtum hit gewearð, þæt þa twegen kyningas wæron adrifene fram Assyria cynges; and eac þæt ylce he witgode be ælcum rihtwisum menn þe ærest geswenced byð, and eft gearod; and eac be Criste, and be Iudeum, he witgode þæt ylce.

Thorpe, p. 113.

The paraphrast in the above introduction has expanded his original by using 2 Kings, XVI, 1–9, where the events referred to in the argument are related. In the Anglo-Saxon text the proper names have been corrupted in copying. Following are the corrected forms as they appear in the Vulgate: Sacces (genitive), Rumeles suna = Phacee, filius Romeliæ; Rassess (genitive) = Rasin; Achats = Achaz.

Ps. 46.—Machabæorum personæ carmen hoc quasi triumphale præcinitur, quoniam, victis gentibus vel Judæis prævaricatoribus, templum est cum sacris ritibus instauratum. . . .

Exegesis, p. 727.

Dauid sang þysne syx and feowertigoþan sealm, and lærde on þam sealme ealle þeoda, þæt hy heredon þone God mid him, mid ælcum þæra cræftum, þe man God mid herian mihte; þone God þe hine swa arlice gefriðode on eallum his earfodum, and ealle his fynd gebrytte; and eac he witegode be Machabeum, þæt hy sceoldon þæt ylce don, þa hy alydsde wæron æt elðeodegum folcum; and eac he witegode be ælcum ryhtwisum geswenctum, and eft alysdum; and eac be Criste, and be Iudeum. Thorpe, p. 115.

The first clause shows use, also, of the first verse of the psalm—*Omnes gentes, plaudite manibus; jubilate Deo in voce exultationis.*

Ps. 47.—*Aestimatione hominum ignorantium Deum, ex his quæ in civitate operatus est, magnus apparuit. . .*

Exegesis, p. 729.

Dauid sang þysne seofon and feowertigoþan sealm, mycliende þone wunderlican sige Godes, þe he þa and oftor ær dyde; hu hrædllice he oferswiððe swa ofermode kyningas; and eac he lærde ælcne man þe geswære and ofercumen, and eft gefriðod byð, þæt he swa ylce Gode ðancode, and his anweald herede; and þæt ylce he witgode be Criste, þæt he þæt ylce sceolde cweðan to his Fæder, æfter ðære æriste. Thorpe, p. 117.

The Latin argument here is so obscure as to be scarcely intelligible. As a consequence, the introduction can hardly be said to depend on the original and has been composed almost solely with a reference to the psalm itself. The interpretation of the last clause, however, was suggested by the words *secunda Sabbati* in the Vulgate title: *Psalmus cantici filiis Core secunda Sabbati*. These words are interpreted like the similar *prima Sabbati* in the title to Ps. 23 (q. v.). Cf. *Explanatio* for that psalm.

Ps. 48.—*Communis exhortatio ad omnes homines dirigitur, ne sæculi divitias magnipendant, sed pro his potius, si forte affluent, Deo gratias referant, easque pro æterna requie dispensent (argument). In quarta [sectione Psalmi] commonet [Christus] suos, ne timeant divites sæculi, qui omnia bona sua cum luce relinquunt (explanatio).* *Exegesis*, p. 733.

Dauid sang þysne eahta and feowertigoðan sealm, on þam he lærde ealle menn, ge on his dagum ge æfter his dagum, þæt hy hy upp ne ahofen for heora welum, and þæt hy ongeaton, þæt hi ne mihton þa welan mid him lædan heonon of weorulde; and eac he lærde þæt þa ðearfan hy ne forðohton, ne ne wenden þæt God heora ne rohte; and eac he witgode þæt ealle rihtwise menn sceoldon þæt ylce læran; and eac þæt Crist wolde þæt ylce læran, þonne he come. Thorpe, p. 119.

Ps. 49.—In priore psalmo ad omnes homines sermonem direxit, nunc ad Judæos loquitur, consternare volens et emendare peccantes, qui, virtutum negligentes, solas curarent hostias. Quod totum exsequitur terribiliore suggestu, quasi tribunal judiciale describens, ut sit tota compellatio Dei plena terroris (argument) Sciendum plane quod hic psalmus utrumque Domini prophetet adventum (explanatio).

Exegesis, p. 739 f.

Dauid sang þysne nigen and feowertigoðan sealm be ægþrum to-cyme Cristes: on þam sealm he cydde hu egeslice Crist ðreatode Iudeas, and ealle heora gelican þe þæt ylce doð þæt hy dydon; forþam hy sealdon ælmessan, and ofredon Gode heora nytenu, næs hy sylfe. Thorpe, p. 123.

Ps. 50.—In finem psalmus David, cum venit ad eum Nathan propheta, quando intravit ad Bersabee (Vulgate title). Sub occasione penitentiae, qualiter populus in Babylone captivus poenitere debeat ostendit. Item in Actis apostolorum ubi Paulus eligitur et vox Pauli poenitentis. *Exegesis*, p. 747.

Dauid sang þysne fiftigoðan sealm, hreowsiende for ðam ærendum, ðe Nathan, se witga, him sæde; þæt wæs, þæt he hæfde gesyngod wið Ureus, þone Cyðþiscan, þa he hine beswac for his wifes þingum, þære nama wæs Bersabe; and heac he witgode, on þam sealm, be Israela folce; hu hy sceoldon hreowsian hyra hæftnyd on Babilonia, and eac be Sancte Paule þam Apostle, and be ælcum rihtwisum men he witgode; hu hy sceoldon syngian, and eft hreowsian: he cwæð.

Thorpe, p. 126.

Ultimate Source of the Anglo-Saxon Introductions.

Having pointed out and discussed in the preceding section the originals from which the interpretations of the Anglo-Saxon

Introductions to the Psalms in the prose division of the Paris Psalter were immediately drawn, I shall now proceed to trace those interpretations to their ultimate source. As the question will be found to possess an independent interest, apart from its bearing upon the Paris Psalter, I will enter into it more fully than would be required with that object alone in view.

It will, perhaps, be of interest to students of Psalm criticism in general, to learn that with certain definite exceptions, which I shall point out below, the peculiar historical interpretations which, as we have seen, are incorporated in the arguments of *Exegesis* and which distinguish it among all Latin commentaries of the Middle Ages, coincide throughout with those of the Syriac commentary on the Psalms existing in MS., Sachau, No. 215, of the Royal Library at Berlin. As Anglo-Saxon Introductions are preserved for Ps. 1–50 only, we have had no occasion as yet to speak of the arguments in *Exegesis* after Ps. 50. But similar ones exist for the remaining psalms as well, characterized by the same method of interpretation, and the statement just made with reference to the Syriac Commentary applies to the arguments of *Exegesis* throughout the whole Book of Psalms. In an article entitled “Der Psalmencommentar des Theodor von Mopsuestia in syrischer Bearbeitung,” *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, V, 53 ff, 1885, Prof. Friedrich Baethgen has proved this Syriac Commentary to represent simply an epitome of the commentary of Theodore (circa 350–428), Bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia, the contemporary of St. Augustine and St. Jerome, the friend of John Chrysostom and the chief of the Antiochene School of Exegesis, whose work had been hitherto known only in rather scanty fragments of the original Greek (Migne, LXVI, 647–696, Series Græca). Although the work, as a whole, as far as I can learn, still remains in MS., Prof. Baethgen has published in the article cited—the first of a series in the same review relating to Theodore’s Commentary—partly in the original, but, for the most part, in translation only, the superscriptions which stand before each psalm in the Syriac MS.,

laying down the special interpretation to be applied to that psalm. By a further comparison of these superscriptions with those contained in the Scholia of Bar-Hebraeus, Prof. Baethgen has been able to prove that the latter represent the same tradition of Theodorean interpretation. In the two works the superscriptions are, in fact, essentially the same. With reference to the date of the Syriac epitome (the Sachau MS. was written as late as 1882. *Z. a. W.*, p. 54), Prof. Baethgen has been unable to trace the tradition it represents beyond the above-mentioned Scholia of the Syriac Commentator, Bar-Hebraeus, whose death occurred in 1286. I would call attention to the fact that the source of Theodorean interpretation which I now indicate in *Exegesis* has, at least, the interest of being some centuries earlier than this, since even the MS. of the Anglo-Saxon Psalter dates from the eleventh century, and the origin of *Exegesis* should, probably, be referred, as we shall see, to a considerably earlier period of the Middle Ages.

Before entering upon an examination in detail of the question concerning the origin of the arguments of *Exegesis*, which has been indicated above, it may be advisable in the interest of those who have had no occasion to occupy themselves with the subject to say a few words with regard to the distinguishing characteristics of Theodore's method of interpretation. Stated briefly, the most marked characteristic, pertaining in a measure to the Antiochene school in general, but in the most eminent degree and in quite a special sense to Theodore, is the principle of interpreting the Psalms according to their literal and historical meaning in contradistinction to the principle of mystical or allegorical interpretation which, originating at an early period with the Jews, and encouraged in the Christian Church especially by the example of Origen, was so universally practiced during the Middle Ages. It is this distinction which ever since the beginnings of modern scientific criticism seems to have given to Theodore's works in this field the first place among the ancient commentaries on the Bible. "Omnes veteres græcæ et latinæ ecclesiæ doctores qui unquam in libros

sacros commentati sunt, longe superasse videtur Theodorus Mopsuestenus" (J. J. Rosenmüller, *Historia Interpretationis Librorum Sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana*, III, 250. Hildesburgh and Leipsic, 1797–1814). Two of the most eminent of contemporary scholars in Psalm criticism, Prof. T. K. Cheyne of Oxford, and Prof. Baethgen of Greifswald, have not hesitated to ascribe weight to the opinions of Theodore, even in the present state of Psalm criticism. See respectively, *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 16, 30 *et passim*, London, 1891, and *Z. a. W.*, VI, p. 262. Says the latter in the passage just cited: "Die Art wie er sich über die Überschriften der Psalmen äussert und die von ihm streng durchgeführte historische Deutung, welche an keinem Punkte die Allegorie, die Todfeindin aller gesunden Exegese duldet, lassen ihn in seiner Umgebung als einen Fremdling erscheinen, als Angehörigen einer um viele Jahrhunderte jüngeren Epoche."¹

It was just this feature, however, of Theodore's system of interpretation, which gives his work enduring value in the opinion of the critics cited, that secured the condemnation of his memory, and, in a large measure, the destruction of his works in the ages immediately succeeding his own. Moreover, the controversies which arose with reference to the doctrines of his pupil, Nestorius, did much to cast a shadow upon the name of the master in the Church, both in the East and in the West, until at length, under the influence of the Emperor

¹ The encomium of M. Rénan in a similar sense with reference to Theodore's critical attitude towards the *Song of Solomon* may also be of interest in this connection. (Theodore anticipated modern criticism by more than a thousand years in rejecting this book from the Bible as a profane work.)

"Une seule voix, avant le XVI^e siècle, s'éleva pour maintenir les droits de la saine exégèse; ce fut celle de Theodore de Mopsueste" (*Le Cantique des Cantiques*, par E. Rénan, Paris, 1860, p. 130).

In marked contrast to the above are the expressions from the Catholic point of view on the same subject by the author of the article on Theodore in Migne's *Dictionnaire de Patrologie*, IV, 1521. "Ces fragments (i. e., of Theodore on the *Song of Solomon*) font horreur. Theodore ne voulait pas même que l'on mît ce livre au rang des écritures canoniques ni qu'on y cherchât aucun sens spirituel et prophétique."

Justinian, he was anathematized in his person as well as in his works at the Fifth General Council, held in Constantinople, in the year 553, his commentary on the Psalms, as we shall see, being especially mentioned in the condemnation (H. Kihn, *Theodor von Mopsuestia und Junilius Africanus als Exegeten*, Freiburg, 1880, p. 48). Henceforth Theodore's works disappear from the West,¹ and it was only among the followers of Nestorius in Asia Minor and Persia that his name was still cherished and his commentaries handed down. By the Nestorian sect of the East he is revered to the present day as the commentator *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. It is to this reverence that we owe the preservation of the Syriac commentary which in epitomized form represents, as has been stated, the ultimate source of the introductions of the Paris Psalter, the MS. of this work—Sachau, No. 215, of the Royal Library at Berlin, mentioned above—having been obtained by Prof. Eduard Sachau from the Nestorian village of Tell Kêf, near Mosul, in the Valley of the Tigris, after his return from his scientific journey in the East (1879–1880), as one of the fruits of that journey.²

To return to Theodore's system of historical interpretation, it is characterized by a single limitation which springs from the influences of his age, and which constitutes the only marked weakness, one may say, of his method. Although he was bold enough to stand practically alone in rejecting the authority of the Septuagint superscriptions and struck out independently his own line of interpretation, it seems singular, unless we keep in mind the powerfully restraining influence of his environment, that he should, nevertheless, have accepted the theory of Davidic authorship for the whole Book of Psalms. He conceives the psalms to have been all composed by David, as prophecies

¹ We shall see later on that portions of them circulated there under another name.

² See *Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachauschen Sammlung Syrischer Handschriften*, von E. Sachau, Berlin, 1885, p. 20, together with the same author's *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, Leipzig, 1883, pp. 359 f.

of future events in the history of the people of Israel. In these prophecies, according to his conception, nearly everything (τὰ πλείστα ἢ τὰ πάντα σχέδον) that David says is spoken by him as if in the situation of the person or persons concerning whom the prophecy is uttered. That is, King David assumes, in speaking, the character of the person to whom the prophecy refers and utters the language which is suitable to the situation. He identifies himself absolutely with such person or persons, except that he adds warnings, in case they are in happy situations, to thank God in the language he himself uses, or, in case they are in trouble, to confess their sins to God, and pray him for good fortune, likewise in the same language as he himself uses.¹

The system which has just been described appears at first sight to represent a compromise by which, whilst propitiating the prevalent orthodox interpretation of the psalms, the author secures a liberty of interpretation as unrestricted as any applied by modern criticism. The compromise, however, is, of course, not intentional, being rather a result of the combined conditions of a strong tradition and of subtle metaphysical thought which existed in the Greek Church during the age in which Theodore flourished.

The above is, probably, sufficient to render intelligible what might otherwise appear strange in the form of Theodore's interpretations, and we can now approach the comparison of the arguments of *Exegesis* with their originals, with the discussion of whatever difficulties arise.

Notwithstanding the coincidence which has been observed above between the interpretation of the superscriptions of the Syriac epitome and those of the arguments of *Exegesis* there could hardly be supposed to exist any direct relation between the two. In any event it will be subsequently pointed out that such a relation does not exist. Both were drawn, in the last instance, of course, from the Greek of the original com-

¹ See the argument quoted from Corderius by Baethgen, *Z. a. W.*, VI, 267, Note 2.

mentary. Whether the arguments of *Exegesis* existed first as part of a Latin version of Theodore's commentary, or were translated independently, is a question not yet ripe for consideration. It is sufficient for the present to say that no such version has been preserved, and in order to establish the character of the arguments of *Exegesis*, I shall proceed to compare them directly with the original Greek *ὑποθέσεις* or arguments with which Theodore was in the habit of beginning his commentary of the individual psalms, and from which the *argumenta* of *Exegesis* were evidently drawn,—wherever these have come down to us. I shall afterwards consider the cases in which the authority of the Syriac epitome and of *Exegesis* conflict with regard to the interpretations of Theodore.

All that was known till recently to have been preserved of the original commentary will be found in the volume of Migne mentioned above: *Patrologiæ Cursus completus, Series Græca*, Tom. LXVI, pp. 647–696. Prof. Baethgen, however, in the invaluable articles from which I have already quoted so frequently has brought to light many fragments not recognized before in Corderius' catena of Greek commentaries on the Psalms: *Expositio Patrum Græcorum in Psalmos, a Balthasare Corderio*, Soc. Jesu, etc., 3 vols., Antwerp, 1643–1646. He has done this in an exhaustive manner especially for the Maccabæan Psalms in his two articles entitled: "Siebenzehn makkabäische Psalmen nach Theodor von Mopsuestia," *Z. a. W.*, VI, 261–288; VII, 1–60. In regard to the quotations from the Greek which occur in the following, I have drawn them primarily from Baethgen's articles as embodying the fullest knowledge we possess of the extant *ὑποθέσεις* of Theodore, but I have also had recourse to the originals in Migne and Corderius, and, wherever the above *ὑποθέσεις* are given by Baethgen in a form which seemed too abridged for the purposes of my comparison, I have reproduced them direct from one of these two works, as the case might be. I am, of course, only concerned with the *ὑποθέσεις*

or arguments, since it is these that are the direct originals of the historical sections of the arguments in *Exegesis*. In order to fix the nature of Theodore's interpretations in the case of psalms where such arguments of the original Greek were no longer extant, Prof. Baethgen has often cited fragments of commentary on verses of the psalms where such had been preserved. I shall, of course, have occasion to take these into account later on, but to reproduce them in full in this place along with the *ὑποθέσεις* would be beside the purpose of my quotations.

Let us take up the Maccabaeian Psalms, first of all, as Prof. Baethgen has treated them separately, more abundant fragments relating to these having been recovered than for any other category of Psalms. It is to be remembered that citations are according to the Vulgate numbering.

Ps. 44.—(Greek not preserved.)

Ps. 46.—(Greek not preserved.)

Ps. 54.—Ex persona Oniæ sacerdotis sponte Aegyptum petentis psalmus iste depromitur, quando Jason propinquus ejus, sed honoris et vitæ illius æmulus, ab Antiocho Seleuci filio, pontificatum redemit, ea conditione, ut omnes Judaeos in gentilium scita traduceret. Ipse vero Onias, constructo in Aegypto altari, ritus sacros, quos Jerosolymis Jason profanaverat, cum Judaeis qui invenire [sic] potuerant, antistes devotus instauravit.

Exegesis, p. 764.

. . . . 'Ἄλλ' ἐν τούτοις ὄντος τοῦ 'Ονίου, τελευτᾷ μὲν ὁ Σέλευκος, παραλαμβάνει δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν ὁ 'Επιφανὴς 'Αντίοχος, ἐφ' οὗ 'Ιάσων τις ἀδελφὸς τοῦ 'Ονίου ἔφησε πολλῶν χρημάτων πρόσδοτον τῷ βασιλεῖ προσάξαι, εἰ λάβοιτο τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ· δώσειν δὲ καὶ ἕτερα πλείονα, εἰ καὶ γυμνάσιον κατασκευάσειεν ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ τὴν περιτομὴν αὐτῶν λύσειεν, καὶ ὅλως ἐξαλλάξαι τὰ νόμιμα συγχωρηθῇ. 'Επίσθη τούτοις τοῖς ῥήμασι, παραδίδωσί τε αὐτῷ τὴν ἀρχήν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν 'Ονίας εὐσεβέστατός τε καὶ δικαιοτάτος ὢν ἀνὴρ, ἔξω τῆς ἀρχιερωσύνης κατέστη· ὁ δὲ 'Ιάσων, τῆς τε ἱερωσύνης καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐπιλαβόμενος, εὐθὺς ἐπὶ

τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα μετήγαγεν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους . . . ταῦτα ὁρῶν ὁ μακάριος Ὀνίας ἐπὶ πολὺ γενόμενα, ἡθύμει καὶ ἡγανάκει καὶ ἐστέναζεν· ὥς δὲ καὶ προβαῖνον ἑώρα τὸ κακὸν, καταλιπὼν ἀνεχώρησεν καὶ εἰς τὴν Αἴγυπτον καλῶν (ita codex), θυσιαστήριόν τε ἐπήξατο καὶ ναὸν κατεσκεύασεν, καὶ τῆς εἰς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείας ἐπεμελήσατο, τοῖς ἐκεῖ Ἰουδαίοις τὰ δέοντα περὶ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ θεραπείαν ὑποτιθέμενος. ταῦτα ὁ μακάριος προφητεύει Δαβὶδ ἐν τῷ παρόντι ψαλμῷ· καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ὀνίου πρόσωπον ἀναλαβὼν, ταῦτα ἐφθέγγετο ὅσα εἰκὸς ἦν λέγειν ἐκείνῳ, ἐπιβουλευόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν οἰκείων, ἐκβαλλομένου τῆς ἱερωσύνης ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀντιόχου ὁρῶντα τὴν μοχθηρίαν τῶν τότε τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων διὰ τε τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ πλεονεξίας, καὶ τὴν τῶν νομίμων ἐναλλαγὴν, καὶ τὴν ἐκάστοτε γινομένην τῶν κακῶν ἐπίτασιν, ἥδη καὶ περὶ φυγῆς βουλευόμενον. Migne, S. G., LXVI, p. 676.

As will be seen on a comparison of the above, the argument of *Exegesis* here is simply a brief epitome of the original *ὑπόθεσις* of Theodore. The superscription to this psalm in the Syriac epitome (which, following Baethgen, I shall henceforth designate *N*) appears much briefer though evidently drawn from the same *ὑπόθεσις*. On the other hand, the corresponding superscription in the *Scholía* of Bar-Hebraeus is quite as full as that of *Exegesis*, though different. I subjoin the superscriptions of *N* and Bar-Hebraeus respectively, for this psalm, as I shall for a few others, to show by comparison that the arguments of *Exegesis* represent an epitomization of the original Greek, which is independent of those represented by the two works above named.

“The Word of David in the person of Onias when he came before God concerning the treachery of his kinsmen who were about him; and concerning the evils which were being done among his people on account of their avarice.” (*N*, Z. a. W., V, 88. This translation of the Syriac was furnished me by my colleague, Dr. Barton).

“Aus der Person des Onias, als er sich vor Gott beklagte über die Nachstellungen seiner Verwandten und ihrer Frech-

heit. Nachdem nämlich das Volk aus Babel zurückgekehrt war, war Onias, ein gerechter Mann, Hoher Priester und Leiter. Nun versprach Jason, sein Bruder dem Antiochus viel Geld, erhielt die Hohepriesterwürde, und vertauschte das Leben nach dem Gesetz mit heidnischer Sitte. Onias aber aufgebracht über seinen Bruder und über Simon, einen anderen Mann aus dem Stamme Benjamin, ging nach Aegypten, baute dort einen Tempel und unterwies die dortigen Juden in dem was Noth that (Bar-Hebraeus, *Z. a. W.*, VI, 283. Baethgen's translation).

Ps. 55.—Machabaeorum supplicatio, quando in ultionem regis conjurantes tam prævaricatores cives quam etiam hostes expugnare tentabant. *Exegesis*, p. 774.

Theodore rejects the double Septuagint title and interprets the psalm as referring to the Maccabees (*Z. a. W.*, VII, 2). Prof. Baethgen quotes (*Ib.* 3) a fragment of Theodore's commentary to this psalm from Corderius which contains a brief narrative of the events related 1 Maccabees, I, 12–III, 60. It was this passage that the epitomist of the Latin argument had before him. After describing the death of Mattathias and the succession of Judas Maccabaeus the original proceeds:—

. . . Ἀναδεξάμενοι δὲ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους κινδύνους πολλοὺς καὶ συνεχεῖς πρὸς τε τοὺς Ἀντιόχου στρατηγοὺς πρὸς τε τοὺς περιοίκους ἔσχον τὰς μάχας, ἐκείνων ἀνελεῖν αὐτοὺς παντὶ τρόπῳ βουλομένων. ἦν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο πάντων χεῖρον ἢ τῶν οἰκείων προδοσία· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὀλίγοι τινὲς πρὸς τὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἔβλεπον, οἱ καὶ πολλῶν κακῶν αἴτιοι γεγόνασι. τόνδε τοίνυν ποιεῖται τὸν ψαλμὸν ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν Μακκαβαίων προσώπου, λέγων ὅσα ἐκείνοις εἰπείν ἤρμωσεν ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς. (Corderius, II, 88.)

Ps. 56.—Et hic Machabæorum verum incipiente jam victoria lætabunda formatur oratio. *Exegesis*, p. 778.

περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν (i. e., Maccabees) κἀνταῦθά φησιν ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν τῷ προτέρῳ (i. e., Ps. 55) ὡς ἐν συμφοραῖς ὄντων καὶ πασχόντων μεγάλα φησὶ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ βοήθειαν αἰτοῦντων· ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὡς ἐπὶ γεγενημέναις νίκαις

κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐχαριστούντων, εἰ καὶ ὡς ὀλίγου τινὸς ὄντος ἔτι τοῦ περιλιμπανουμένου κακοῦ. Corderius, II, 110, quoted by Baethgen, *Z. a. W.*, VII, 13.

Ps. 57.—Crescente in dies fama, et victoria Machabæorum, quidam se illis inimici fraudulentè admiscebant, a quibus et Jonathas et Simon cum filiis interempti. Hos ergo psalmus iste redarguit. *Exegesis*, p. 782.

πολλῆς καὶ παραδόξου τοῖς Μακκαβαίοις παρασχεθείσης τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθείας, ἐχώρει μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον ὁσημέραι τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς, πολλὴν δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανε τὸ τῶν ἐναντίων. καὶ δὴ τούτων οὕτω γινομένων, πολλοῖς οἱ ἐναντίοι τοῖς δόλοισι ἐχρῶντο, ὡς ἂν ἡττώμενοι ταῖς μάχαις πανουργία καὶ τῇ τῆς φιλίας ὑποκρίσει κατορθῶσαι τὸ σπουδαζόμενον δυνηθῶσι. . . . Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο τελευτήσαντος μὲν τοῦ Ἰούδα, Ἰωνάθαν δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ διαδεξαμένου τὴν ἀρχὴν, Τρύφων τις, πολλῇ πανουργίᾳ χρησάμενος, συνέλαβέ τε αὐτὸν καὶ συγκλείσας ἀνείλε . . . ταῦτα δὲ πόρρωθεν σημαίνει ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ [καὶ] ἐν τῷδε προαγορεύει τῷ ψαλμῷ. Corderius, II, 128 f., quoted by Baethgen, *Z. a. W.*, VII, 18 f.

The words *Simon cum filiis* have no parallel in the Greek and were, doubtless, added without authority by the epitomist of the arguments. They do not seem properly to belong here as the deaths of Jonathan and of Simon and his sons were separated by many years. Compare, respectively, 1 Maccabees, XII, 42; XIII, 23 and XVI, 11–16.

Ps. 58.—Hæc etiam psalmus in persona Machabæorum formatur. *Exegesis*, p. 786.

τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Μακκαβαίους καὶ ἐν τῷ μετὰ χεῖρας προαγορεύει ψαλμῷ, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ ἐκείνων προσώπου λέγων ἅπερ εἰπεῖν αὐτοῖς ἤρμωσεν ἐν θλίψεσι τε πολλοῖς ἐξεταζομένοις καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δεομένοις βοηθείας. Corderius, II, 152, quoted by Baethgen, V, 88 f.

Ps. 59.—(Greek not preserved.)

Ps. 61.—Verba Machabæorum, quando ab Antiocho sacrificare et profanari cgebantur. *Exegesis*, p. 842.

The portion of Theodore's *ὑπόθεσις*, referring the psalm to the Maccabæan period is not extant. Of the fragments of commentary, however, which Prof. Baethgen has recovered, that which is explanatory of verse 5, seems to correspond to the argument.

Μονονουχὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ λογικοῦ ἡμᾶς ἀπεστέρησαν (i. e., the generals of Antiochus) ξύλα καὶ λίθους ἀναγκάζοντες προσκυνεῖν, ὡς καὶ λέγεσθαι περὶ ἡμῶν, ἄνθρωπος ἐν τιμῇ ὧν οὐ συνῆκε.

Z. a. W., VII, 31.

It is curious how nearly the superscription of Bar-Hebraeus corresponds in expression with the Latin. "Aus der Person der Makkabäer, als sie von Antiochus gedrängt wurden, den Götzen zu opfern.

Z. a. W., VII, 30.

Ps. 68.—Machabæorum personis causisque conveniens aptatur oratio.

προσαγορεύων τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Μακκαβαίους διηγείται τῶν συμφορῶν τὸ μέγεθος λέγων μὲν τοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων ἐπενεχθέντας αὐτοῖς πολέμους, λέγων δὲ καὶ τὴν παρὰ τῶν ιδίων ἐπιβουλήν, συνήθως μέντοι ὡς ἐξ ἐκείνων ἅπαντα λέγεται τὰ κατ' αὐτούς.

Z. a. W., V, 78.

Ps. 73.—Machabæorum et pericula narrantur et preces connectuntur.

Exegesis, p. 873.

τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐνταῦθα διηγείται τὰς συμφορὰς ὡς ἂν ἐκείνων λεγόντων τό τε μέγεθος τῶν τότε περιεχόντων αὐτοὺς κακῶν καὶ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τὸν θεὸν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἀξιόντων.

Z. a. W., V, 90.

Ps. 78.—In persona Machabæorum canitur, qui sub Antiocho Epiphane patrias leges moeniaque patre Matathia auctore, ultimis coacti malis, defendere aggressi sunt.

Exegesis, p. 910.

The Greek *ὑπόθεσις* is too long to quote in full. After describing how Antiochus had done violence to the temple and the city of Jerusalem, it continues :

ταῦτα οὖν ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ ἐκ προσώπου τῶν Μακκαβαίων φησὶν, οἳ τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντων πόλεμον πρὸς τοὺς Ἀντιόχου στρατηγούς ἀνεδέξαντο, Ματταθία μὲν ἀρξαμένου, διαδεξαμένου δὲ παρ' ἐκείνου τὸν πόλεμον τοῦ υἱοῦ.

Z. a. W., VII, 49.

Ps. 79.—Et hic Machabæorum preces resonant, ut Dominus consueta beneficia non subtrahat. *Exegesis*, p. 914.

διήγησις εἶτε καὶ προαγόρευσις τῶν κατὰ τοὺς Μακκαβαίους καὶ ὅδε ψαλμὸς ὑπὸ τῶν τότε εἰρημένος παραδεικνύντων μὲν τὰ οἰκεῖα κακὰ, μνημονευόντων δὲ καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ αὐτοὺς εὐεργεσίας καὶ ἀξιούντων ὁμοίως καὶ νῦν τυχεῖν τῆς προνοίας παραπλησίως. *Z. a. W.*, V, 91.

Ps. 82.—(Greek not preserved.)

Ps. 107.—(Greek not preserved.)

Ps. 108.—The original ὑπόθεσις not preserved, but, to judge from its close correspondence with *Exegesis*, the words of the anonymous paraphrast stand close to the original.

Sub Machabæorum persona canitur, deplorantium quæ ab exteris et domesticis adversa pertulerunt, postulantiumque ultionem in eos qui Antiochum vel Demetrium reges in eorum odia falsa criminatione succenderant, quique venalem fecerant sacerdotii dignitatem; quod non tantum excluso Onia factum est, sed per omne tempus deinceps quo Judaea Machabæis est præliantibus liberata. *Exegesis*, p. 1029.

Ἐκ προσώπου εἰρῆσθαι τὸν ψαλμὸν τινες εἶπον τῶν ἐν τοῖς Μακκαβαίοις φιλαρέτων, φευγόντων καὶ ἐλαυνομένων, οἷον Ὀνίου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν, οὓς τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀπήλασαν ἐτέροις ταύτην ἀπεμπολήσαντες. *Z. a. W.*, VII, 57.

Ps. 143.—Different interpretation in *Exegesis* from that in *N* and Bar-Hebraeus to be examined later.

With the above the Psalms are exhausted which Theodore interpreted as Maccabæan.

The comparison with the extant Greek fragments for the remainder of the psalms I will take up in their numerical order.

Ps. 4.—Different interpretation in *Exegesis* to that in *N* and BH, to be examined later.

Ps. 32.—Post victoriam de Assyriis carmen triumphale componitur in quo docetur irritæ spei esse omnia quibus præter Deum mortales exsultant. *Exegesis*, p. 645.

τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἐζεκίου παρεσχεθεῖσαν νίκην τοῖς Ἰσραηλίταις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς παραδόξου τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἀναιρέσεως, προφητεύων ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ψαλμῷ ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ ὥσπερ τινα ἐπινίκιον ὕμνον ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγεννημένοις αὐτὸν ἀνεβόησε, τὸ σύννηθες αὐτῷ. ἀντεῦθεν διαπραττόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τοὺς Ἀσσυρίους ὑποθέσεως τρεπόμενος μὲν εἰς καθολικὴν ὕμνοδιαν τοῦ δεσπότου καὶ ἐξήγησιν τῶν ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γεγονότων· παιδεύων δὲ πάντας μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσι μεγάλοις πεποιθέναι, ἀλλὰ πάντων ἡγεῖσθαι δυνατώτεραν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν βοήθειαν.

Corderius, I, 574.

Ps. 49.—In priore psalmo ad omnes homines sermonem direxit, nunc ad Judaeos loquitur, consternare volens et emendare peccantes, qui, virtutum negligentes, solas curarent hostias. Quod totum exsequitur terribiliore suggestu, quasi tribunal judiciale describens ut sit tota compellatio Dei plena terroris.

Exegesis, p. 739.

καὶ οὗτος ἠθικὸς ὁ ψαλμὸς, ἀλλ' οὐκέτι πρὸς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους, πρὸς Ἰουδαίους δὲ μόνον ὥσανεὶ ἀμελοῦντας μὲν ἀρετῆς, τὸ δὲ πᾶν τιθεμένους ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις τοῦ νόμου, ὥς τοῦ εἰδέναι τὰ ῥήματα μόνον ἐπιμελουμένους οὐκετι δὲ καὶ τὰ προστάγματα φυλάττειν. καὶ φοβερότερον αὐτοῖς κατασκευάζων τὸν λόγον σχηματοποιεῖ κριτὴν δικάζοντα καὶ τοὺς ἐλεγχομένους.

Corderius, I, 963.

Ps. 60.—Ex persona populi in Babylone positi et pro sua libertate deprecantis psalmus iste componitur, cui tamen spem nutrierat reversionis in patriam.

Exegesis, p. 798.

τὰ κατὰ Βαβυλῶνα προαγορεύει νῦν, οὕτω τὸν ψαλμὸν ἐκφωνῶν ὥσανεὶ αἰτούντων ἐκείνων τυχεῖν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ βοηθείας, ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον προὔπισχνούμενος.

Corderius, II, 199.

Ps. 64.—Reditum populi de Babylone prædicat, ex persona revertentium loquens.

Exegesis, p. 814.

τὴν ἐπάνοδον τοῦ λαοῦ προαγορεύων ἐν τῷδε τῷ ψαλμῷ ἐκ τοῦ ἐκείνων προσώπου ταῦτά φησιν ἅπερ εἰπεῖν αὐτοῖς ἤρμοττεν τῆς ἐπανόδου μέλλουσιν ἀπολαβεῖν κτέ.

Corderius, II, 265.

Ps. 65.—Et hic reditum populi designat verum ex persona illorum loquens, qui inter eos merito celsiores, cum superius carmen totius populi preces et vota contineat.

Exegesis, p. 819.

κάνταῦθα μὲν προαγορεύει τὴν ἐπάνοδον· οὐκέτι δὲ ὡς ἐκ προσώπου πάντων τὸν ψαλμὸν φησιν ἀλλ' ἐκ μόνων τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς θαυμαστῶν τε καὶ ἐναρέτων ἀνδρῶν.

Corderius, II, 287.

Ps. 67.—Cum arcam testamenti post crebras migrationes tandem David ad se grandi exsultationis ambitu transferret, carmen hoc cecinit, memorque itineris illius et transductionis quondam in eremo, quasi ex persona principum illius temporis, psalmum composuit. Ipsum versum in capite ponens, quem et Moyses tunc, quoties in signum profectionis arca movebatur, decantare solebat.

Exegesis, p. 828.

The *ὑπόθεσις* is altogether too long for quotation. I will only quote those parts that have been especially used. After describing the wanderings of the ark he proceeds:—

. . . . πάλιν ἀπελθὼν μετὰ πάντος τοῦ πλήθους ἐκόμισεν αὐτὴν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, φαιδρὰν τὴν πανήγυριν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀνόδῳ τῆς κιβωτοῦ ποιησάμενος· θύματά τε κατασφάξας πολλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔμπροσθεν σκιρτῶν καὶ ἀλλόμενος ὑπὸ τῆς εὐφροσύνης ὅθεν καὶ προοίμιον ποιεῖται τῷ ψαλμῷ τουτῷ ᾧπερ ἐκέχρητο ὁ μακάριος Μωσῆς, κινουμένης τῆς κιβωτοῦ εἰς τὸ μεταστῆναι ἅπαντας τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ ὥσπερ κινουμένης τότε τῆς κιβωτοῦ εἰς μετάστασιν καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου ὁμοιότητα, ποιεῖται προοίμιον ἀπὸ τῶν Μακαρίου Μωσέως φωνῶν ἀρχόμενος.

Corderius, II, 336.

Ps. 70.—Prædicit ea quæ erat populus in Babylone passurus, et hæc ad emendationem ventura, simul etiam reditum promittens.

Exegesis, p. 854.

τὰ κατὰ τὸν λαὸν προαγορεύει τὸν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ὅσα τε καὶ οἷα πείσονται· λέγων ὅτι εἰς διόρθωσιν αὐτοῖς ἔσται τοῦ βίου τὰ τῶν συμφορῶν· ὑπαινίττεται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐπάνοδον κτε.

Corderius, II, 438.

Ps. 72.—Qua expostulatione populus in Babylone captivus adversus providentiam usus sit indicatur ; et quod pro exploratione virtutis in hac vita plerumque iusti cruciantur, nec non inopinatis aliquoties successibus attolluntur.

Exegesis, p. 868.

κάνταῦθα τοίνυν ἐστὶν ὑπόθεσις αὐτῷ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ ὁ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι λαὸς, ὡς ἐκ προσώπου ἐκείνων λέγοντος οἷα εἰκὸς ἦν ἐν τῷ καίρῳ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας καὶ τῶν συμφορῶν αὐτοὺς λογισαμένους ἀτοπώτατά τε καὶ ἀπρεπῇ περὶ θεοῦ μεταγινώσκειν ἐπὶ τούτοις μετὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον. Λέγει δὲ καὶ ταῦτα οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐπειδήπερ ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν ταῖς συμφοραῖς εἰς λογισμοὺς τε καταπίπτειν ἀτόπους καὶ ἐννοίας ἀπρεπεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ τὸν λαὸν παιδεύει πάντας, μὴ τοῦτο ὑπομένειν διὰ τούτων ὥσπερ πράγματι παιδεύων ἡμᾶς, εἰδέναι ὡς ὁ θεὸς πολλάκις οἰκονομῶν τι, καταλιμπάνει μὲν πρὸς ὀλίγον πάσχειν ὑπὸ ἀσέβων καὶ ἀδίκων ἀνθρώπων· παρέχει δὲ πάντως καὶ ἀπροσδόκητον τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν κτε.

Corderius, II, 497.

Ps. 74.—Post victoriam de Sennacherib, ex totius populi persona redduntur officia votaue gratiarum.

Exegesis, p. 881.

τὴν κατὰ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐζεκίου νίκην γενομένην ἐν τούτῳ προφητεύει τῷ ψαλμῷ, ὡς ἐκ προσώπου κοίνου πάντων τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις ἀναφθεγγόμενος.

Corderius, II, 550.

Ps. 76.—Prædicat ea quæ erat populus in Babylone passurus, et qualiter pro his ipsis libere querimoniam facturus, sicut et in septuagesimo secundo psalmo.

Exegesis, p. 888.

λέγει μὲν κάνταῦθα τὰ κατὰ τὸν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι λαὸν ἐξηγούμενος. ἔχει δὲ τινα ὁμοιότατα ἐν τῷ σχήματι πρὸς τὸν οἱ ψαλμὸν ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ φησιν ὅσα τε καὶ οἷα ὑπὸ τῶν συμβαινόντων πραγμάτων λογίζεσθαι προήγοντο· οὕτω κάνταῦθα λέγει ὅσα μὲν ἔπασχον καὶ οἷα· τίνα δὲ καὶ ἐννοεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν συμφορῶν ἠναγκάζοντο. ταῦτα δὲ λέγει κατὰ τὸ

συνήθες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκείνων προσώπου ὥσανεὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον λεγόντων τὰ τότε συμβαίνοντα καὶ τίνα ἐλογίσαντο.

Corderius, II, 588 f.

Ps. 77.—Vertutis studia, legisque custodiam propheta populo commendans, hunc psalmum composuit; in quo monet, ut Deum reverenter metuant, quo sanctiones legis suæ beneficiorum largitate prævenerit, ut hi qui jam erant obnoxii, facilius subderentur. Postremo hortatur, ut servent intenta mente concordiam.

Exegesis, p. 893.

Διὸ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ πάντας Ἰουδαίους προτρέπων ἐπ' ἄρετήν καὶ σπουδαιοτέρους περὶ τὴν τοῦ νομοῦ φυλακὴν ἐργάσασθαι βουλόμενος, κέχρηται τῷ ψαλμῷ, διηγούμενος τὰ περὶ τὸ γένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγονότα, ὅπως ἐξήγαγε τῆς Ἀιγύπτου, ὅπως διήγαγε τὴν ἔρεμον, ὅπως τε εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας· διὰ πάντων παιδεύων ἀνάλογον τῇ χάριτι τοῦ εὐεργέτου τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπιδεικνύσθαι προαίρεσιν. τελευταίον μέντοι καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους αὐτῶν ὁμονοίας τε καὶ συμφωνίας τὰ εἰκότα διαλέγει.

Corderius, II, 630 f.

Ps. 80.—Reditum populi de Babylone prædicens, omnes ad gratiarum provocat actionem.

Exegesis, p. 919.

τὴν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος ἐπάνοδον τοῦ λαοῦ προαγορεύων, ἐπὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἅπαντας ὁ μακάριος Δαβὶδ διὰ τοῦδε προτρέπεται τοῦ ψαλμοῦ.

Corderius, III, 691.

With the above examples are exhausted the original *ὑποθέσεις* of Theodore which Prof. Baethgen has recovered. It will be seen that in all instances except Ps. 4, 143, there is complete agreement as to the interpretation between the Latin and the Greek. These examples suffice, also, to show the nature of the relation of the Latin arguments to the original Greek. The relation is so obviously one of direct dependence that no further discussion of the point is needed, I think. When the *ὑποθέσεις* were very full, a greater degree of compression was necessary to bring them within the limits which were prescribed by the object of the Latin arguments. This was the case with the majority of examples quoted. On the

other hand where an *ὑπόθεσις* appears stated in a few words, it is followed quite literally by the Latin. So, Ps. 49, 64, 65, 70, 74, 80.

I have set forth in the above, the manner in which the Latin arguments were drawn from the Greek in the comparatively few cases where this was possible. The object of these pages was to establish the existence and the exact nature of that dependence, and to exhibit incidentally the value of the arguments of *Exegesis* as sources for Theodore's interpretation of the psalms.

It only remains to add that in a few other cases (Ps. 44, 46, 51, 52, 53, 59, 61, 83, 107) we have fragments of the original commentary on the verses of the psalms which fix the nature of that interpretation, although the *ὑποθέσεις* have not been preserved. In all these cases, the Latin shows the same agreement with the Greek which has already been pointed out by Baethgen for the Syriac. With the cases cited, however, the authority of the original commentary is exhausted. For all other psalms we are thrown back upon other sources of information, the chief of which,—in fact, the only one in all but a few instances,—is the Syriac epitome of which superscriptions have been published in Baethgen's article. As the authority of this epitome is confirmed in every instance by the other sources of information, wherever such exist, it will not be necessary in the following discussion to take into consideration any of such sources except in an incidental manner.

We can now enter upon a comparison between the superscriptions of *N* and the arguments of *Exegesis* throughout their whole extent.

It will be found on comparison that the interpretations of these two authorities differ only in the following cases, namely, Ps. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 37, 47, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 150 (possibly). I do not take Ps. 87 into account, as only the mystical section of the argument for this psalm has been preserved in *Exegesis*.

In all other cases they exhibit coincidence of interpretation.¹ To make this relation manifest to the reader, however, by an exhaustive citation of examples as has been done in the comparison of the arguments with their originals in the Greek would involve too great a consumption of space, inasmuch as the subject lies somewhat apart from the original object of this dissertation and would, beside, simply result in a confirmation of the above statement. I will, consequently, confine myself to what is more profitable—a discussion, namely, of those cases in which the interpretations of the two works differ. I will not reproduce the Latin arguments in full again for the psalms preceding Ps. 50, since that has already been done in connection with the comparison made with the Anglo-Saxon introductions, but will restate them in substance simply. The Syriac superscriptions are given according to Baethgen's translations.

Ps. 2.—“Weissagung auf das was bei dem Leiden unsers Herrn von den Juden verübt wurde: zugleich erinnert aus der Psalm an seine Menschheit.” *Z. a. W.*, V, 68.

A general complaint of David to God concerning the hostility of the Gentiles and the people of Israel towards himself. *Exegesis*, p. 489.

¹ In the case of Ps. 85, 107 an alternative interpretation is given besides the one in which *Exegesis* coincides with *N*. In each instance the alternative refers the psalm to circumstances of the life of David himself. If we consult Corderius we find (II, 757) the evidence of *N* as to the interpretation of Ps. 85 confirmed, namely, that it was spoken solely in the person of Hezekiah. The passage is set down in the Catena under the name of Diodorus, but like other passages of the kind in Corderius, is, no doubt, due to Theodore. It is curious that the double interpretation of *Exegesis*,—connecting the psalm with both David and Hezekiah,—should be found in the *Commentarius* [*Theodori*] *Heracleotae* (Corderius, II, 755). There is no means of applying a test similar to the above in the case of Ps. 107.

What has just been remarked with regard to alternative interpretations of Ps. 85, 107 is true also of Ps. 9, 141, 142, 143, but as it will be proved that the arguments in these cases are spurious, there is no use of considering them in detail.

Ps. 3.—“Auf sich selbst dichtete David diesen Psalm in der Zeit, da er von seinem Sohne Absalon verfolgt wurde.”

Z. a. W., V, 92.

Hezekiah invoking God, when surrounded by the Assyrian host.

Exegesis, p. 494.

Ps. 4.—“Widerlegt diejenigen welche sagen dass keine Regierung in den Erscheinungen herrscht, sondern dass die Welt in Wirren dahingeht.”

Z. a. W., V, 84.

Hezekiah glorying over his enemies concerning the help he received from God.

Exegesis, p. 501.

Ps. 5.—“Weissagung auf das Volk in Babel das Gott um Rückkehr bittet.”

Z. a. W., V, 94.

Hezekiah returns thanks to God after his sickness.

Exegesis, p. 506.

Ps. 6.—“Gebet Davids als er in Nöthen war wegen seiner Vergehungen gegen Batseba.”

Z. a. W., V, 61.

Hezekiah's invocation to God, whilst sick.

Exegesis, p. 511.

Ps. 7.—“Gesprochen von David als er hörte, dass Achitophel sich erhängt hatte.”

Z. a. W., V, 92.

Hezekiah prays to God, when calumniated by his enemies and betrayed by his own people.

Exegesis, p. 515.

Ps. 8.—“Weissagt auf unsern Herrn Christus und lehrt uns den Unterschied der Personen.”

Z. a. W., V, 92.

The prophet expresses admiration of God's power and returns thanks that he has been mindful of man.

Exegesis, p. 524.

Ps. 11.—Tadel derer, welche hinterlistig gegen ihre Freunde sind.”

Z. a. W., V, 85.

Lament of David that in his time truth had diminished among men.

Exegesis, p. 547.

Ps. 12.—“Gebet Davids wegen seiner Sünde gegen Batseba.”

Z. a. W., V, 92.

Prayer of Hezekiah when besieged by the Assyrians.

Exegesis, p. 550.

Ps. 14.—“Gesprochen im Namen des Volkes nachdem sie aus den Kriegen mit den Assyrenn gerettet waren.”

Z. a. W., V, 93.

Words of the captives in Babylon desiring a return to their country.

Exegesis, p. 556.

Ps. 15.—“Gebet des Volks um Errettung aus den Bedrängnissen, von denen es umgeben war” (*Z. a. W.*, V, 77) relates to David's time (*ib.*, p. 92).

Prayer of Hezekiah in his sickness and rejoicing on his recovery.

Exegesis, p. 557.

Ps. 37.—“Gesprochen von David auf sich selbst wegen seiner Sünde gegen Batseba als er von Absalom verfolgt wurde und seine Sünde bekannte.”

Z. a. W., V, 92.

Hezekiah, being sick, prays to God.

Exegesis, p. 679.

Ps. 47.—“Erzählt von Hiskia, sofern dieser jedermann aufforderte Gott zu danken für den Sieg, der ihm über die Assyrrer verliehn war.”

Z. a. W., V, 94.

Sets forth the greatness of God as shown in his works.

Exegesis, p. 729.

Ps. 139.—“Gebet Davids um Rettung vor Saul und vor den Ohrenbläsern und Hinterlistigen die bei ihm waren.”

Z. a. W., V, 93.

Ezechias contra Assyrios orat, ne videlicet exterorum vi vel fraude superetur.

Exegesis, p. 1094.

Ps. 140.—“Auf das Volk in Babel gesprochen, sofern dasselbe erzählt, dass es in Folge der Verbannung gute und rechte Sittlichkeit gewonnen habe.”

Z. a. W., V, 98.

Sub persona Ezechiae canitur, poenitentiam exercentis, ne contra iram Assyriorum raperetur in iram.

Exegesis, p. 1094.

Ps. 141.—“Gebet des Volks in Babel welches Gott um Aufhören seiner Leiden anfleht.”

Titulus (i. e., Vulgate) manifestus est de David. Potest et ab Ezechia obsessó accipi.

Exegesis, p. 1095.

Ps. 142.—“[Auf] das Volk in Babel, welches im Gebet zu Gott fleht.”

Z. a. W., V, 98.

Titulus (i. e., Vulgate) apertus est a David contra Absalom agi. Potest et ab Ezechia contra Sennacherib dictum intelligi.

Exegesis, p. 1095.

Ps. 143.—“Dank der Makkabäer für ihren Sieg, den sie über ihre Feinde davongetragen hatten.” *Z. a. W.*, V, 99.

Hunc quoque psalmum ipse titulus exponit, nec minus etiam Ezechiae gratiarum actio prætenditur, de obsidione et de infirmitate salvati.

Exegesis, p. 1095.

Ps. 150.—Vermahnung an das Volk, Gott seinen Schöpfer allezeit zu loben.

Z. a. W., V, 98.

Bar-Hebraeus (s. p. 98, note 2) refers to the Babylonian period. Hortatur propheta tam posteros quam præsentis ut psallendi insistant officiis.

Exegesis, p. 1098.

The reader has now set before him all cases of divergent interpretation. It will be observed, first of all, with reference to the nature of this divergence that even in the cases just cited where the arguments of *Exegesis* show an interpretation differing from that of the Syriac superscriptions, they are still marked by the especial characteristics of Theodorean interpretation, especially its historical spirit. It may be, furthermore, stated that, considering the total number of cases of undoubted divergence—namely, nineteen—we find that in all but five Psalms—2, 8, 11, 14, 47—the peculiarity of *Exegesis* consists in its reference of these Psalms to the reign of King Hezekiah which are not so referred by *N*. Notwithstanding this observance, however, of the spirit of Theodore's interpretation, I think it will be found on an examination of the question, wherever it can be brought to the test, except, perhaps, in the case of Ps. 47, that the Syriac epitome and not *Exegesis* represents correctly the interpretation of the original commentary.

In several cases the fact can be established by comparison with *ὑποθέσεις* or fragments of the commentary which have been preserved.

Ps. 2.—Baethgen (*Z. a. W.*, V, 67) contents himself with citing the statement of the Nestorian Kosmas Indicopleustes as confirmatory of the evidence of *N*, to the effect that this was one

of the four psalms which Theodore accepted as prophecies concerning Christ. I think the following fragment set down by the side of the marginal *Theodori* in Corderius, I, 32, shows this to be the case from his own words :

To v. 7 : "Dominus dixit ad me, Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te," he adds, *πρὸ αἰώνων υἱὸς σήμερον γεγέννηται γεγενόμενος ἄνθρωπος.*

Ps. 3.—Theodore's original *ὑπόθεσις* to this psalm, though not quoted by Baethgen, will be found in full, Corderius, I, 44. The following sentence which I quote demonstrates sufficiently that *N* and not *Exegesis* preserves the original interpretation correctly :

κατ' ἐκείνον τοίνυν τὸν καιρὸν τὸν πατραλοῖαν ἀποδιδράσκων υἱὸν καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀναδεξαμένους παρατάξιν τοῦτον ἔγραψε τὸν ψαλμὸν κτε.

Ps. 4.—. . . διδάσκει τοίνυν ἐν τῷ παρόντι ψαλμῷ τοὺς ἀθεῖαν νοσοῦντας, καὶ προνοιεῖν τὸν θεὸν καὶ κυβερνᾶν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα μὴ νομίζοντας κτε. Corderius, I, 63, agrees with *N*, not *Exegesis*. The same will be remarked of the quotations for the two following psalms : 8, 15.

Ps. 8.—. . . τοῦ μὲν Κυρίου ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν λαμβάνοντος τὰ πρότερα τοῦ ψαλμοῦ, ἐν οἷς ποιητὴν τε αὐτὸν εἶναι τῆς κτίσεως . . . τοῦ δὲ Ἀποστόλου τὰ δεύτερα περὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ τῆς τοσαύτης εὐεργεσίας ἀξιωθέντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λαμβάνοντος κτε. Migne, Series Græca, LXVI, 1004.

Ps. 15.—ὁμοίός ἐστι τῷ ἐννάτῳ κατὰ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν. Κάν-ταῦθα γὰρ εὐχαρίσται ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν περιοίκων ἀναιρέσεως τιμωρηθέντων ὑπὸ θεοῦ· ὃ δὲ καὶ γέγονεν ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Πολλοὺς γὰρ καὶ μικροῦ πάντας τοὺς περιοίκους ἐτιμωρήσατο διὰ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ συμμαχίας. Ἄπαντα μέντοι τὰ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ ὡς ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ φησιν. Corderius, I, 272, not quoted by Baethgen.

For the remaining thirteen cases there is no help to be derived from the extant fragments of Theodore. It will be sufficient, however, I think, to point out that in every case, except Ps. 47, 141, the interpretation of *N* as against that of

Exegesis is supported by the arguments of the anonymous Paraphrast in Corderius, who, as Prof. Baethgen (*Z. a. W.*, VI, 273) has remarked, usually represents the interpretations of Theodore. Even in the case of the two exceptions cited, though the Paraphrast differs from *N*, there is no coincidence with *Exegesis*. When we consider, moreover, the fact remarked above that in every case where the words of Theodore are preserved, they agree with the superscriptions of *N*, I think that we may safely accept in these cases the combined authority of the Paraphrast and *N* as decisive.

But if, as, I think, is evident from the above, *Exegesis* does not represent in the nineteen cases cited the genuine tradition of Theodorean interpretation, how are we to explain these departures from the original? It should be remarked at once that the changes are not made on any definite principle.¹ For instance, of the four Psalms—2, 8, 44, 109—which we know Theodore to have interpreted directly as prophecies of Christ, the last two are left in agreement with the original, the first two not. The psalms whose interpretation appears thus changed may belong to any of the categories which Theodore distinguished (*Z. a. W.*, V, 83). Thus Ps. 4 belongs under the category *περὶ προνοίας*, Ps. 12 under that which is entitled *περὶ ἡθῶν διδασκαλικά*, and the rest under the various historical categories.

It might again be possible that the varying interpretations were adopted from some other commentator. This, however, is extremely improbable, as the method of interpretation they exhibit is distinctive of Theodore and of him alone among the ancient commentators. With a view to this possibility I have looked through the works of his contemporaries of the Antio-

¹ It may be worth noting that the three Psalms, 15, 21, 68, Theodore's interpretations of which according to the theory of types which he later developed were anathematized by the Fifth General Council, appear interpreted historically in *Exegesis* just as in *N* (s. Baethgen, *Z. a. W.*, V, 77). We have seen already, however, that the interpretation of Ps. 15 in *Exegesis* is not correct.

chene schools, John Chrysostom and Theodoret, on the Psalms, as most likely to offer something similar, but without success. There is a significant fact, however, which I shall now note concerning the distribution of the psalms characterized by this divergent interpretation in *Exegesis* which seems to me to suggest the most probable explanation of its origin. It will be observed on examination that out of the nineteen psalms in question twelve occur among the first fifteen psalms of the Vulgate version and five towards the end in a group, namely, Ps. 139–143. Two only—Ps. 37 and 47—occur in the middle of the Book of Psalms, and of these two it may be remarked that the nature of Theodore's interpretation of one, at least, Ps. 47, is not altogether settled, inasmuch as the anonymous Paraphrast of Corderius, differing from both *N* and *Exegesis*, refers it to the return of the captives from Babylon (Corderius, II, 898). It may be also remarked with reference to this psalm that the Latin in which the argument is expressed is obscure; the sentence leaves rather the impression of being compressed unskilfully from a larger whole. A consideration of the circumstances I have mentioned suggests very strongly that the compiler of the arguments in *Exegesis* drew the interpretations of Theodore embodied in these pieces from a manuscript which was damaged at the beginning and near the end, and that in an accident of this nature, alone, is to be sought the explanation of the divergent interpretations. Not having before him the originals or representatives of the originals for these psalms, he supplied them out of his own invention after the model of those arguments which had been preserved in his manuscript. I think that the above suggestion will command a strong degree of acceptance, when it is considered, as has been pointed out, that there is no discernible reason for variation in the case of just these nineteen psalms in the nature of the psalms, themselves, and that the rest of the arguments—one hundred and thirty-one in number—reflect faithfully the original interpretations of Theodore. As it is certain that these variations are departures from the

originals, there must have been some point in the course of tradition where the invention of another mind came in, and the facts concerning the distribution of the spurious arguments seem to fix for us that point and the occasion of variation.

Having determined in the above the origin of the non-mystical sections of the arguments in the pseudo-Bede, and having succeeded in separating, as I believe, what is genuine from what is spurious in the same, the question next arises what is the relation of these sections to the commentary in which they occur and how was it that interpretations so suspicious on their face should have gained adoption in the work of a theologian of the Western Church, remarkable for nothing if not for strictness of orthodoxy?

I must at once express my own conviction that the sections referred to were not incorporated in this work by the author of the pseudo-Bede, himself. This conviction is based chiefly upon the observed fact that nowhere is there the slightest trace in the commentary proper of the influence of the interpretations laid down in these sections of the arguments. The work is throughout one of an unvaryingly orthodox character and, like all the medieval commentaries of the Western Church, is largely a compilation from the most authoritative of the earlier patristic writers. It has already been remarked, though with a slight exaggeration, by J. M. Neale (*A Commentary on the Psalms from Primitive and Medieval Writers*, 3d ed., London, 1874, Vol. I, 78), that this commentary "is principally taken from Cassiodorus." St. Augustine and St. Jerome, however, are also frequently used in it, and it would be impossible altogether to find a work marked by a more rigorous adherence to the system of allegorical interpretation as practised by the doctors of the Medieval Church.¹

¹ It is confirmatory of this view that in the four cases, Ps. 39, 58, 92, 121, where verses of the psalms are quoted in the arguments, the readings of these verses are different in two instances (Ps. 39, 92) from those which appear in the commentary proper. On consulting P. Sabbatier, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latine Versiones Antiquæ*, Vol. II, Rheims, 1743, I find that the

In order that I may be able to offer a probable explanation of the process by which the interpretations of this heterodox and anathematized theologian of the remote East became incorporated in a commentary of Western Europe of the character I have described, it will be necessary for me, though in as brief a space as possible, to endeavor to trace more exactly the history of the pseudo-Bede. There will be the less occasion to regret this necessity, inasmuch as the question, as far as I can find after diligent search, has hitherto received no attention whatever, the interest of it, indeed, being for a Protestant,

reading *Eripe me de inimicis meis, Deus meus* (Ps. 58) was common to both Itala and Vulgate. Similarly, the reading *Dominus custodiat introitum tuum et exitum tuum* (quoted Ps. 121) is the same in each, with possible transposition of *Dominus*. On the other hand, the reading of the argument for Ps. 39 coincides with that of the Roman Psalter, *deprecationem meam* for *preces meas*, and the reading of the argument for Ps. 92, *Quoniam inhabitata est terra* (only with *quando* instead of *quoniam*) is common both to the Roman Psalter and the Itala. The commentary proper (like the Vulgate title) has *quando fundata est terra*. It is hardly probable that these differences would have remained unchanged, had the author of the commentary, himself, prefixed the arguments. Furthermore, to be considered is the frequent occurrence in the arguments of directions like *Lege apud Lucam* (Ps. 2), *Legendus ad Esaiam* (Ps. 6) *et passim*, inserted obviously with reference to the liturgical use of the psalm. It is hardly probable that the author of the commentary would have inserted practical directions of this nature—and not with perfect regularity—in the arguments to his work. At least, I can find nothing similar in the other medieval commentaries.

Liturgical scholars will, no doubt, recognize at once the meaning of these directions. The following explanation, however, of Cardinal Tomasi's has been of service to me:—*Cæterum cum* in his [argumentis Psalmorum] animadverterit lector, *Lege ad Evangelium Matthæi, ad Genesim, ad Esaiam, etc., meminerit oportet* priscæ consuetudinis, qua inter solemnia post lectiones veteris vel novi Testamenti, ante lectionem vero Evangelii, integer psalmus a toto Ecclesiæ cœtu respondebatur; propterea nuncupatus ab antiquis Psalmus Responsorius. Qui sane mos per totum Occidentem ad VI usque sæculum perduravit; quem et in Romana item Ecclesia fuisse constat ex Serm. I. S. Leonis Papæ. Respondebatur autem Psalmus (ut loquitur S. Ambrosius) hoc ritu. Lector stans in Ambonis gradu, Psalmi titulo præmisso, mox Psalmum ipsum præcinebat quem per singulos quosque versus totus Ecclesiæ cœtus respondebat, hoc est, repetebat, etc., *Thomasi Opera Omnia II, Ad Lectorem, Section XIII, Rome, 1747-1754.*

at least, rather insignificant but for its connection with the question of the origin of the arguments.

The commentary, then, entitled *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* first¹ made its appearance in print in the Basel edition of Bede's collected works, 1563. It covers pp. 419-1058 of the eighth volume of that edition and is described on its title-page as "recens inventus." The editor of this edition in his *Epistola Nuncupatoria* expatiates upon the dangers and difficulties he overcame in collecting the writings of Bede, but neglects to tell us in any single instance where the MSS. were to be found from which he edits them. I have been unable to discover either by search or inquiry thus far in what library of Europe there may exist a MS. or MSS. of the commentary on the Psalms which this editor, without stating his grounds, incorporates in the works of Bede—along with an immense mass of undoubtedly spurious material, it may be added. The commentary reappears in the Cologne editions of 1612 and 1688, Vol. VIII, pp. 307-896 (division into volumes and pagination being the same in these editions), but the editors are again completely silent as to the source of their manuscripts. Except in the places just named, our commentary is to be found only in Migne's *Patrologiæ Cursus completus*, XCIII, 478-1098, being reprinted there from the Cologne edition as among the *Dubia et Spuria* ascribed to Bede. In the edition of Bede's works, more critical than its predecessors, put forth by J. A. Giles, 12 vols., London, 1843-44, the *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* does not appear.

If we come to examine the grounds on which the early editors of Bede included the commentary among his writings, we shall soon come to the conclusion expressed by Oudin,

¹ I have not seen the first collective edition of Bede's works in 8 vols. issued by Franciscus Jameticus, Paris, 1554, but I believe I may rely upon the silence of those who have seen it and on the expression of the title-page to Vol. VIII of the Basel edition to make this statement. The Paris edition of 1554, of which the British Museum possesses no copy, is the only edition of any part of Bede's theological writings which I have not consulted.

Commentarius, I, 1706, "Nihil habet quo Bedae affirmetur, unde spurius censi debet." These editors have not taken pains to state whether the MS. from which they drew the commentary was their authority for ascribing it to Bede but it is hardly probable that such was the case, seeing that they have thought it worth their while to justify this ascription by the following fabrication introduced immediately after the uncompleted commentary on Ps. 121 (Migne, XCIII, 1089). It should be remembered that from this point on the commentary proper ceases and we have only *Argumenta* and *Explanationes* left.

Ad Lectorem.

Beda cum historiam, quam ecclesiasticam vocat, scripserat, jam tum annum agebat 60, a discipulis deinde, licet sæpius rogatus, mysteriorum sacrarumque in Psalmis divinationum recessus cogitans, explicationem illius libri aggredi volebat, tamen ut quoquo modo suis satisfaceret, argumenta in singulos psalmos brevi confecit. Auditores vero ipsius, cum importuni iterum instarent, tandem eis titulos psalmorum brevissimis explicationibus illustravit; quibus absolutis, desideriis propriis plus indulgentes quam præceptoris senium reverentes, eo Venerabilem virum adegerunt, ut etiam integros commentarios in psalmos scriberet. Quos quidem omnes morte præventus, cum jam CXX explicasset, absolvere non potuit, opus tamen inimitabile hoc relinquens. Desiderantur præterea hinc inde quædam in hoc nostro Exemplari, ubi puncta posita sunt, ea an senis scriptoris intermissione, aut discipulorum collectione neglecta, aut amanuensium incuria deperierint, incertum nobis est.

In the above address to the reader, the editor is careful to date the composition of the commentary after the completion of the Ecclesiastical History (A. D. 731), inasmuch as, at the close of this work, Bede himself, added a full list of his writings up to that date (Giles' edition, III, 312-316), among which no commentary on the Psalms is mentioned. Apart

from the consideration that there is no record elsewhere of the events related in it, the following facts prove that the above address is exclusively the product of the editor's imagination.

1. I have shown already that the non-mystical sections of the arguments ascribed by the editor to Bede are really the *ὑποθέσεις* of Theodore of Mopsuestia in epitomized form.

2. I have not traced to their sources the mystical sections of the same arguments, which would be a task both tedious and unprofitable in the extreme, but they are evidently borrowed.¹ It is sufficient to point out that a few of them (e. g., Ps. 1, 21) are drawn verbatim from so common a work as the pseudo-Jerome's *Breviarium in Psalmos*.

3. The *Explanationes* are made up in each case simply of excerpts taken word for word from the commentary on the corresponding psalm in the *Expositio in Psalterium* of Cassiodorus (Migne, LXX, 9-1056). This was kindly pointed out to me by the Abbé Morin, of Maredsous, Belgium.

After disposing of the above fabrication, the outlines of which, for the rest, were evidently furnished by the well-known story of Bede's translation of St. John's Gospel, *Cuthberti Epistola de obitu Venerabilis Bedæ* (Giles' edition, I, CLXIII-CLXVI), we may safely say in the absence of testimony from any other source and in consideration of its diffuse style, very different from that of the genuine works, that the editor of the Basel edition had no reason for incorporating the *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* among the writings of Bede. Its rejection on the ground that no evidence whatever had been produced for ascribing it to Bede seems first to have

¹ All these mystical rubrics will be found in the *Collectio argumentorum in Psalmos* of the eminent liturgist of the last century, Cardinal Tomasi: s. *Thomasii Opera Omnia*, II, p. XLVI, Rome, 1747. This collection is headed *Ex dictis Origenis*, which would lead one to suppose that they were due to Origen. The examples cited, however, show that this is not the case. Tomasi means, no doubt, "in accordance with Origen's allegorical principles of interpretation," and this would be correct. He obtained them, no doubt, direct from the pseudo-Bede.

been proposed by Mabillon (*Acta Sanctorum ordinis S. Benedicti, Saec. III, Pars Prima*, p. 556, Paris, 1672), and subsequent writers on the subject like Oudin, Gehle and Werner¹ have one after the other tacitly or explicitly accepted it as spurious. Compare, for instance, Gehle's *Disputatio Historico-Theologica* (pp. 100 f.), which is the chief source of present information concerning the authenticity and chronology of Bede's writings.

Since it is sufficiently evident from the above that Bede was not the author of the commentary which has been thus printed among his works, to whom, then, should it be correctly ascribed?² Through the courtesy and erudition of the learned Catholic theologian to whom I have already referred, I believe that I am in a position to return a satisfactory answer to the above question. In addition to the point of information mentioned above, I am also indebted to the Abbé Morin for an identification of the author of the pseudo-Bede with the Benedictine commentator of the eighth century, Ambrose Autpert, concerning whom I copy the following notice from the *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum et Antiquorum Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum primo quidem a M. de la Bigne in lucem edita*, Lugduni, 1677, Vol. XIII, *Series authorum et opusculorum*, p. 2 :—

“Ambrosius Autpertus sive Ansbertus monachus ordinis S. Benedicti ac deinde Abbas Monasterii S. Vincentii ad Fontes

¹ C. Oudin (already quoted) *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae antiquis*, I, 1706, Leipsic, 1722.—H. Gehle, *Disputatio Historico-Theologica de Bedae Venerabilis Presbyteri Anglo-Saxonis vita et scriptis*, Preface II, and pp. 100 f., Lugduni-Batavorum, 1838.—K. Werner, *Beda der Ehrwürdige und seine Zeit.*, pp. 228 ff., Vienna, 1875.

² The suggestion of Nicholas Rigault, one of the seventeenth century editors of Tertullian (quoted Migne, I, 634, note e.), that it was a work of St. Jerome may be at once dismissed, since not only are the works of this Father frequently quoted in the commentary (e. g., 517, A, 759, D, *et passim*), as has been already pointed out, but the commentary itself is largely drawn from the *Expositio* of Cassiodorus whose birth occurred nearly half a century after the death of Jerome.

Vulturni in Samnio siti qui floruit tempore Desiderii Longobardorum regis (id est, anno circiter 770) ut ipsemet loquitur ad calcem sui operis et ut ex Paulo Diacono libro sexto de gestis Longobardorum, Cap. 40, discimus, necnon et chronicis S. Vincentii de Vulturno cujus excerpta publicavit Duchesnius tom 3, in quibus dicitur obiisse Autpertus anno Christi 778. Indictione 2 et in Beati Petri Ecclesia digno sepulchro locatus, cum Abbatiam illam rexisset anno uno, mensibus duobus, et diebus 25, scripsit diversa opuscula, ut author est Trithemius et Sigebertus, ex quibus extant commentaria in Apocalypsim distincta in libros decem fol. 403, quod opus propter facilitatem ipsum intelligendi speculum parvulorum vocavit."

That this abbot was the author of a commentary on the Psalms is known to us from the following passage in the Chronicle of the Monastery of St. Vincent. I quote from Migne's reprint, LXXXIX, 1272 :—

"Nam Leviticum Moysi, Cantica Salamonis, Psalterii flores melliflua suavitate, quæ in his divina maneant arcana sacramentorum, quæve uniuscujusque fidelis disciplina morum, sive Christi observatio mandatorum, suorum edisserens patefecit documento verborum."

There has been no proof of its preservation produced in modern times (cf. Fabricius, Migne, LXXXIX, 1265, B). The following reasons, however, for believing that it is identical with the pseudo-Bede have been privately communicated to me by the Abbé Morin.

1. The striking similarity of style which exists between the pseudo-Bede and the known works of Ambrose Autpert. There is the same striving in the former as in the latter to develop the allegorical meaning of his text so plainly that the commentary may constitute a *speculum parvulorum*, to use the phrase of Autpert, himself. The result is what I may describe as an unexampled prolixity. Especially peculiar to Autpert's commentary on the Apocalypse as to the pseudo-Bede is the perpetual recurrence of such phrases as *quasi dicat, ac si dicat*,

ac si diceret, etc., employed in leading the reader to a new point of view in the interpretation.

2. The use which is made of the pseudo-Bede by Haymo of Halberstadt in his *Explanatio in Psalmos*, Migne, CXVI, 193–696. It has long been known that this writer's work on the Apocalypse is hardly more than an abridgement of the commentary on the same text by Ambrose Autpert (s. *Histoire littéraire de la France*, IV, 147). I have, myself, tested the beginning of Haymo's *Explanatio* (pp. 195 f.) and find it to be drawn here and there verbatim from the pseudo-Bede.

3. Among a number of *Quæstiones* on the earlier books of the Old Testament derived by the editor of Bede from the same source, apparently, as *Exegesis*, there is one entitled *Recapitulatio de paradiso (leg. paradisi) fonte ac fluminibus et ligno vitæ*. A little work bearing this title along with the name *Ambrosii*, apparently the same as that printed in Bede's works, was observed by the authors of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, IV, 159–160, in the library at Fleuri-sur-Loire. These authors already identified the Ambrosius in question with Ambrose Autpert.¹

I am constrained by the original object of this dissertation to reserve for another place an elaboration of the weighty proofs which I have just cited. To become aware of the full force of the first, however, it is only necessary to compare the pseudo-Bede with the single analogous work of Autpert extant, the *In Apocalypsim Expositio* (*Maxima Bibliotheca*, XIII, 403–639). I do not think the marked similarity of treatment can escape anyone who has the patience to undertake that comparison. We have in this essential point a manifest bond of connection between the two works but the other indications

¹ May not the peculiarly close connection of the pseudo-Bede with the *Expositio* of Cassiodore, which has already been remarked on more than once, be due to the proximity of the respective monasteries in which the works were composed? Cassiodore's monastery of Viviers was situated in the ancient province of Southern Italy, known as Bruttium, and his influence may be reasonably supposed to have been especially strong in his native land.

which have been cited lend a strong confirmation, I think, also, to the identification proposed by the Abbé Morin.

Accepting, then, the authorship of Ambrose Autpert for the pseudo-Bede, as will be done, I believe, with increasing readiness when the evidence stated briefly above has been presented with due elaboration, it still remains to attempt some historical explanation of the process by which the interpretations of Theodore of Mopsuestia found their way into a commentary of the Western Church.

At this point of the investigation we are left, indeed, in a large measure to conjecture, but I do not believe that a strong probability will be denied to the theory of this process which I shall now present whilst adducing at each step the evidence on which it rests.

If we except catenae on the Psalms such as the Coislin MS. 204 (Paris), the only medium by which the works of Theodore are known to have penetrated into Western Europe during the Middle Ages was that of Latin translations. It was in this form that according to the investigations of Prof. Swete and others in recent times (*Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni in Epistolae B. Pauli Commentarii*, etc., 2 vols., edited by H. B. Swete, Cambridge, 1880-82, I, pp. xiv-xvi) his exposition of the Pauline Epistles was discovered to have been used, though under an erroneous name, so early as the ninth century by the Irish scholar, known as Sedulius Scotus Junior (beginning of the ninth century), and by Rabanus Maurus (A. D. 788-850)—not to speak of other writers of somewhat later date. This Latin version of Theodore's Commentaries on the Epistles has been edited by Prof. H. B. Swete in the form of the publication whose title I have just cited. In this work (I, pp. LVII ff.) Prof. Swete has endeavored to account for the circulation of these commentaries in the West on the theory that the translation was executed in North Africa in the second half of the sixth century and thence passed through Spain, on the one hand, and Italy on the other, into Northern Europe. It should be said in explanation of Prof. Swete's hypothesis

that the Latin translation of Theodore's Exposition of St. Paul abounds in forms and constructions of North African origin, and that we know that the African Church about the period named, notwithstanding the condemnation of Theodore in the year 553 by the Fifth General Council, or rather, in a measure, in consequence of that condemnation, was still strongly favorable to his theology, even to the point of resisting the edicts of Justinian (p. LIV). I think that the above identification of a commentary in which other portions of Theodore's writings are preserved as the work of an ecclesiastic of Southern Italy—which was made quite independently of the theory of Prof. Swete—gives a decided increase of probability to that theory, whilst an analogous history for these writings at an earlier period is suggested in return. Bearing in mind, then, the analogy of the Exposition of the Pauline Epistles, I think it is only natural to account for the existence of our arguments in Latin dress, preserved in a work of the same part of Europe, by assuming that there likewise existed about the same period a translation of the Exposition of the Psalms, derived from the same quarter. Although the bulk of the Latin arguments in the pseudo-Bede is not very great, I would still suggest that they might possibly reveal North African forms and constructions under the examination of a competent Latinist. Is it not possible that the introduction of this commentary into Italy was due to the diligence of Cassiodore, who, as we know (p. XIV), made efforts, at least, to acquire an Exposition of the Pauline Epistles which were at that time ascribed to a more orthodox theologian, but which Prof. Swete, with great probability in his favor, is inclined to identify as the work of Theodore? The Latin translation which we have supposed of the commentary on the Psalms must have perished owing to the clearly heretical tendencies by which its mode of exposition was characterized, but the arguments adopted from the *ὑποθέσεις* of the original,—very early, as the existence of similar arguments in the Syriac epitome would seem to show—con-

tinued to be preserved by means of the commentary of Ambrose Autpert to which they had become attached. We have seen already that there are difficulties in the way of supposing that the incorporation of these arguments with the *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis* was due to the author of the commentary, himself. The difficulty is, if anything, increased by the identification of this author with Ambrose Autpert—a theologian so sensitive on the score of orthodoxy that he was the first to seek from the Roman pontiff an express decree in approval of his works. See his Epistle to Pope Stephen (La Bigne's *Maxima Bibliotheca*, XIII, 403 f.):

“Nuper in Apocalypsim Joannis decem edidi libros, et quamquam sufficeret mihi quia sanctarum Scripturarum testimoniis verae fidei congruentibus roborati erant, quia præcedentium tractatorum sensu vigeabant; humilitati tamen meæ prospiciens, peto ut vestro etiam decreto profuturi firmi maneant, quod videlicet nullum præter me alium tractatorem fecisse reperio.”

I believe, however, that it is possible to offer an acceptable explanation of the causes which led to the connection of the arguments with just this commentary on the Psalms. It is a very striking circumstance that the only portions of the works of Theodore which have hitherto been known to have obtained circulation in Latin form in the West—the Exposition of St. Paul's Epistles—passed invariably under the name of Ambrose of Milan. Of the six writers anterior to the thirteenth century who show an acquaintance with this work, there is not one who has not cited it under the name of Ambrose (Swete, I, LI, and II, 346) and the same name is attached to all the MSS. of that Commentary which have survived to the present day. It was adopted, no doubt, instead of the name of the genuine author for the purpose of protecting the MSS. from destruction. If there existed, also, as we have good reason to believe, a Latin translation of Theodore's Exposition of the Psalms, it can hardly be doubted that for it, likewise, the protection of the name of the same pillar of the orthodox Catholic faith would have been sought. It would happen, then, through

the confusion easily resulting from an identity of name, that the heterodox arguments, which, if our supposition is correct, gained circulation as parts of a work professedly due to the elder Ambrose, were interpolated in the commentary of his namesake of inferior note. Certain it is that by just this mode of confusion between the names of the two churchmen in question the *In Apocalypsim Expositio* of Ambrose Autpert long passed as a work of Ambrose of Milan, and is, indeed, reprinted as such by Migne, XVII, 843–1058, though with a subsequent warning as to its real authorship, LXXXIX, 1267, 1278.

It must be confessed that in the absence of established data certain links in the chain of the theory which has just been presented have only the strength of conjecture, but I think it will be admitted that, wherever we have been left to this resource, the conjectures, at least, can lay claim to a high degree of probability in the nature of the circumstances involved and that the analogy in particular between the history of the Latin version of Theodore on the Psalms which I have just developed, in substantial points, on the basis of conclusions independently arrived at and the history of the Pauline Commentaries as outlined by Prof. Swete is not altogether accidental in character.¹

¹ It is undesirable to burden the discussion more than is necessary with matter which must be more or less conjectural in its nature. I should like, however, to call attention to an obscure hint, occurring in the argument to Ps. 95 (Migne, XCIII, 990), which might assist us in fixing the date at which the arguments of Theodore became attached to the pseudo-Bede. This argument appears in full, as follows:

“Ob reditum de Babylone gratiarum actio celebratur. Aliter vox Ecclesiae vocantis. Item quae in praecedente psalmo destructam domum nostram flevimus, id est, regulam disciplinae, hic de reparata gratulemur.”

The first sentence embodies the usual Theodorean interpretation of the psalm, but it is the last to which I would especially call attention. The words contain an application of the psalm by the scribe to some recent restoration of discipline, whether in a particular monastery or general order, it is perhaps impossible to say. The term, *regula disciplinae*, however, would seem to apply better to the rule of an order and is used regularly in that sense. On consulting the *Excerpta Chronici S. Vincentii de Vulturno* (André

The only certain data in the history of the pseudo-Bede in the centuries immediately succeeding that of its probable composition are its use by the commentator, Haymo of Halberstadt (*obiit* 853), as has been already pointed out, and by Bishop Bruno of Würzburg (*obiit* 1045), in his *Catena* on the Psalms (See Franz Delitzsch, *Commentar über den Psalter*, II, 441, Leipzig), and by the Anglo-Saxon translator of the Psalms. From this knowledge we may conjecture that it passed quickly into circulation in the rest of Europe. Probably, its connection with the Anglo-Saxon translation is the earliest evidence we have of its use in England, but that the name of Bede was, indeed, substituted for that of its true author in the Anglo-Saxon period—or even, at any later date—we have in the present state of knowledge no reason to affirm. That this should have been the case seems not unlikely from the fact that just this commentary was selected by the Anglo-Saxon translator from which to draw his arguments, but the presumption which might have been created in favor of that supposition through the incorporation of this commentary among the works of Bede by his early editors has been altogether

and Francois Duchesne, *Historiae Francorum Scriptores*, III, 672–700, Paris, 1641), I have been unable to discover any event in the history of the monastery, in which Ambrose Autpert resided which might accord with the above reference, as the devastation of the monastery by the Saracens in the year 843 would scarcely be spoken of simply as a destruction of the *regula disciplinae*. It seems hardly more likely that it should be the question here of the conclusion of the strife between Potho and Autpert concerning the dignity of abbot (Duchesne, III, 788–790), since this occurred through the accident of the latter's death (A. D. 778). If anything is to be made out of this obscure passage, I should prefer to interpret it as a reference to some general reform of the Benedictine order—the order with which Autpert was united and to which a copyist of his commentary would also be most likely to belong. The only reform which could be taken into consideration for so early a period as that with which we are dealing is the first great reform of the Benedictine order which took place through the action of the council at Aix-la-Chapelle in the years 816–817 in the reign of Louis le Debonnaire (*Histoire des ordres Monastiques*, V, 146–154, Paris, 1718). If this is a correct interpretation, the above passage must have been written, of course, very shortly after the event referred to.

discredited by the fabrication which has been exposed in a preceding part of this dissertation. Whether, in spite of this simple invention, there might not have been some evidence in the MSS. they used of the commentary's having been ascribed to Bede at an early period, it will be impossible to say until these MSS. have been brought to light and submitted to examination.

Expansions in the Anglo-Saxon Text.

In the preceding sections we have succeeded in tracing to their ultimate source the introductions of the prose divisions of the Paris Psalter. The possible objection that the Anglo-Saxon paraphrast might have drawn directly from that source—namely, the commentary of Theodore in its original form—is sufficiently met by pointing out that in every one of the instances enumerated where the pseudo-Bede diverges from the interpretation of Theodore the former is reflected in the introductions of the Paris Psalter and not the latter. Moreover, as has been already remarked, the Anglo-Saxon shows occasional use of the mystical sections of the arguments in the pseudo-Bede which, of course, formed no part of the original Greek. Compare, especially, Ps. 19, 22, 50. What has just been remarked of the Anglo-Saxon is likewise true of the Latin rubrics which were also drawn from the arguments of *Exegesis*—only here, as has been already pointed out, the use of the mystical sections is quite regular.

It will be our next task to consider the question concerning the source of the occasional expansions which are observed in the body of the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Psalms, themselves, and which, for the most part, appear enclosed in brackets in Thorpe's edition. These are usually inserted to make plain the literal meaning of the original where a simple translation of the Latin words would not seem to suffice for the purpose, though the insertions, also, frequently partake of the nature of allegorical interpretation.

In view of the connection which has been established between the Anglo-Saxon introductions and the arguments of the pseudo-Bede, it would seem only natural to expect that the expansions in question should be drawn from the commentary proper of the same work. That such is not the case, however, will appear from the following comparison of corresponding passages. There are many instances, it is true, in which the interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon and the pseudo-Bede coincide, but the overwhelming number of examples which exhibit the contrary relation render it evident, I think, that the coincidence in those instances is not due to any direct adoption on the part of the Anglo-Saxon translator. At the same time, it should be remarked that the examples of coincidence are, by no means, without significance, in so far as they go to prove that the Anglo-Saxon translator, in framing these insertions, was only drawing upon the stock of allegorical interpretation which was current in the Medieval Church.

I will set the examples first in which the interpretation of the two works coincide.

Ps. V, 8: *se weg ys min weorc* = *Exegesis*, 509, D:
ut dirigas viam meam, id est, directa facies opera mea. So
 Ps. IX, 24.

Ps. VI, 2: *forþam eall min mægen and eall min ban synt gebrytt and gedrefed and min sawl and min mod ys swyðe gedrefed* = *Exegesis*, 512, D: *quia conturbata sunt ossa mea: id est, quia vires et robora mentis sunt imminuta.* . . . So
 Ps. XXXIII, 20.

Ps. IX, 18: *þy læs se yfel-willenda mæge don þæt he wille* = *Exegesis*, 538, B: *et homo, id est, aliquis terrenus portans veterem hominem, volens eos devocare.* . . .

Ps. IX, 22: *and hine blestiað þa yfelan for his yfelan dædum* = *Exegesis*, 540, D: *iniquus benedicetur, id est, laudatur ab adulatoribus suis in pravis cupiditatibus.*

Ps. IX, 35: *þu forbrycest þone earm and þæt mægen þæs synfullan* = *Exegesis*, 543, B: *brachium, id est, potentiam peccatoris.*

Ps. XI, 5-7. Ac Dryhten cwyð cwæð David = *Exegesis*, 549, C: Hi duo versus præcedentes in voce patris lecti sunt: qui vero loquuntur, in voce Prophetæ vel perfectæ animæ leguntur.

Ps. XV, 8: beforan þære ansyne mines modes = *Exegesis*, 561, A: in conspectu meo interior.

Ps. XVI, 4: ic geþolode hearde wegas and manigfeald earfoðu = *Exegesis*, 563, B: *vias duras* ita ego omnia dura, omnia aspera passus sum.

Ps. XIX, 3: and þin ælmesse sy andfengu = *Exegesis*, 585, D: Illud, inquam, holocaustum fiat pingue, id est delectabile Deo Patri.

Ps. XXII, 5: þæt is þin þreaung and eft þin frefrung = *Exegesis*, 600, A: *virga tua*, id est, paterna correctio tua, et *baculus tuus*, id est, auxilium tuum.

Ps. XXVIII, 5: þa treowa tacniað ofermotra manna anweald = *Exegesis*, 623, C: *Libani* dico *cedros*, id est homines elatos divitiis, potentia, et etiam nobilitate de quolibet populorum.

Ps. XXXIV, 21: Hit is la ful good þæt æfre ure eagan moston geseon þæt we wilnodon = *Exegesis*, 664, C: *Euge, Euge*, id est, bene factum est animæ nostræ quia *oculi nostri viderunt* quod semper videre desideravimus, et quod omnibus modis optavimus.

Ps. XXXVII, 2: þæt synt þa earfoðu þe ic nu þolie = *Exegesis*, 681, C: sagittas vocat omnes pœnas et miserias quas patimur interior sive exterior.

Ps. XLIV, 2: þæt ys Crist, se ys word and tunge God-Fæder: þurh hine synt ealle þincg geworht = *Exegesis*, 715, D: illud verbum per quod terra, mare, cœlum facta sunt et omnis ornatus eorum. *Omnia enim per ipsum*, ut Evangelia testantur, facta sunt.

Ps. XLIV, 4: þæt ys gastlicu lar, seo ys on þam God-spelle = *Exegesis*, 718, C: Gladius iste est verbum divinæ prædicationis.

Ps. XLIV, 10: þa wyrt-gemang tacniað mistlicu mægen Cristes and þæt hrægl tacnað Cristes lichaman, and þa elpan-bænenan hus tacniað rihtwisra manna heortan, þara kyninega dohtor tacniað rihtwisra manna sawla = *Exegesis*, 721, C: *a vestimentis tuis*, id est, a sanctis circumdantibus et ornantibus te, velut corpus vestimentum, spirabunt myrrha et gutta et casia, id est, omnium *odorama virtutum ex quibus* scilicet *odora mentis delectaverunt te filiae regum*, id est, sancti viri *a domibus eburneis*, id est, a cordibus eorum innocentissimis, et castissimis.

Ps. XLIV, 11: þæt ys eall cristnu gesamnung = *Exegesis*, 712, D: *Regina*, id est, *Ecclesia*.

Ps. XLIV, 12: þæt ys seo gesamnuncg cristnes folces = *Exegesis*, 722, B: *Ecce produxit sponsam* (i. e., *Ecclesiam*) et facit nunc apostropham ad eam.

Ps. XLIV, 15: þæt synt mistlice gearnunga fulfremedra manna = *Exegesis*, 723, B: *circumicta varietatibus*, id est multiplex ornamentum virtutum habet exterius.

Ps. XLV, 5: se Hyhsta sende his word and gehwyrfed wæs ure land and ure folc to beteran = *Exegesis*, 726, C: *terra*, id est, plebs gentilis quae, cum prius esset pulvis, modo facta est terra culta.

Ps. XLVII, 6: seo is on þam lande þe Cilicia hatte = *Exegesis*, 751, C: *Fuerunt qui dicerent per Tharsin designari Ciliciam*, regionem opulentissimam et potentissimam, quia Tharsis civitas ejus est metropolis. Cf. Cassiodorus to same verse, Migne, LXX, 338, C: *Tharso Ciliciae*; also, Haymo, Migne, CXVI, 359, C. This occurs frequently repeated in the glosses, so in Royal MS. 2BV.

Ps. XLVIII, 9: þeah hy gesibbe hæbben, hy beð him swyðe fremde ðonne hi nan good æfter him ne doð = *Exegesis*, 737, A: *relinquent illis qui nihil sibi nec eleemosynis nec orationibus proderunt*. Nam et si *relinquent nepotibus et filiis, relinquent tamen, eis ut alienis*, id est, nihil sibi proficientibus.

The above constitute the whole number of instances in which I have been able to detect any marked coincidence of inter-

pretation between the Anglo-Saxon and the pseudo-Bede. It would involve a needless consumption of space to attempt to offer the results of the comparison made in the case of passages where no such coincidence has been observed. Leaving aside the great number of those in which the interpretations of the pseudo-Bede and the Paris Psalter move on altogether different lines, I will only enumerate the verses the interpretations of which in the two works are absolutely incompatible.

Ps. IV, 8, V, 3, VII, 8, 12, VIII, 3, IX, 4, 5, 23, 26, 27, 35, X, 5, 6, XIII, 7, XV, 2, 3, 7, XVI, 10, XVII, 43, XVIII, 12, XXI, 2, XXVIII, 7, XXIX, 3, 5, XXX, 22, XXXI, 7, XXXIV, 12, 13, XXXVI, 20, 22, XL, 1, XLI, 8, XLIV, 17 (general method of interpretation, however, is the same), XLV, 3, XLVI, 9, XLVIII, 5, L, 3.

We have it, then, as a plain result of this and the preceding comparisons that the Anglo-Saxon translator paraphrased the arguments of the pseudo-Bede, drawing occasionally upon *Explanationes*, also, in order to supply the psalms in his translation with introductory prefaces, but that he did not make use of the commentary proper. In view of the respective relations of these prefaces and of the expansions in the body of the Anglo-Saxon translation to the pseudo-Bede, the suspicion might justly be awakened, are these prefaces and the translation, indeed, the work of the same man? That such a question, however, must be answered in the affirmative will appear at once from a comparison of the following passages in which the same distinctive translation of words of the Latin original is found in both the introduction and the translation of the psalm. In each of these cases the translator, in composing the introductions, employs phrases which occur in the psalms.

Ps. XXXVI, 1.—Noli æmulari inter malignantes = Ne wundrie ge þæra yfelwillendra, and þæra orsorgra, ne him na ne onhyriað (v. 1 of the Anglo-Saxon translation).

David . . . lærde ealle geleaffulle þæt hy ne onhyredon þam yfelwillendum, þeah him þuhte þæt hi gesælige and orsorge wæron (Introduction).

The use of the word *orsorg* occurring in both introduction and text without anything to suggest it in the Latin and the peculiar translation of *œmulari* prove that the two translations were executed by the same hand.

Ps. XXXVIII, 16: Remitte mihi ut refrigerer = Forlæt me nu, Drihten, to sumre rothwile on þisse weorulde (v. 16, in Anglo-Saxon translation).

. . . . he wilnode ealra swiðost, þæt him God sealde sume frofre, and sume rothwile on þys andweardum life (Introduction).

Ps. XXXIX, 1: Expectans expectavi Dominum, et respexit me = Næs ic on nauht idlum anbide, þeah hit me lang anbid þuhte, þa ða ic anbidode Godes fultumes (v. 1 of the Anglo-Saxon translation).

David sang þysne nigon and þritigoðan sealm, gylpende on þam sealme, þæt he nauht idel nære, þa he anbidode Godes fultumes (Introduction).

A comparison of the introduction to Ps. IX, with the translation of v. 16 of the same psalm, illustrates the same relation.

The fact, then, that the translator uses the arguments of the pseudo-Bede, solely, and not the commentary proper is placed beyond a doubt. The reasons which influenced him in his procedure will be more fittingly discussed in the section on authorship and I shall therefore postpone my interpretation of the relation observed to that place. In the meanwhile it might be objected that the arguments were probably not known to the translator in connection with the commentary proper in which case the source of the expansions might still be found in some other of the ancient expositions of the Psalms. That I, myself, do not entertain the idea of such a separation as that suggested for the time that our translation was composed will appear from the later discussion. Nevertheless, the possibility of separation at least is to be considered and the consequent possibility that the translator resorted to a different commentary for the expansions in his text. With a view to

settling finally the question as to the source of these expansions I have made comparisons throughout of the passages with corresponding portions of the remaining extant Psalm commentaries of the Western Church written before the middle of the eleventh century¹—the approximate date of the Anglo-Saxon MS. The results of such a comparison for the pseudo-Jerome and St. Augustine's *Enarrationes* have already been presented in full by Wichmann (*Anglia*, XI, 46-48), as has just been done in the preceding pages for the pseudo-Bede. The only commentators besides these whose expositions on the Psalms have come down to us from the period mentioned are Cassiodore, Haymo, Rémi of Auxerre (Remigius Antissiodorensis) and Bruno of Würzburg.² What Delitzsch has said of these and of later expositions of the Psalms in the Middle Ages will be found hardly to exceed the truth by those who follow in his footsteps. "Wenn man einen dieser ausleger kennt, so kennt man schier sie alle. Das meiste was sie bieten ist echo der alten" (*Commentar*, II, 441). The comparisons referred to put it beyond question that the interpolations in the Anglo-Saxon version are not drawn directly from any of these commentaries. It would be useless to burden our pages with the numerous proofs of this negative result which accumulated under my examination. I think it desirable on the other hand to cite from these works a list of passages not altogether inconsiderable in number which do

¹ I do not speak here of partial commentaries like those of Alcuin and Pope Gregory I. on the Penitential Psalms or of St. Hilary on select psalms, although I have also made the comparison for these works with sufficient exactness to assure myself that the works in question, also, furnished no aid to our translator.

² References for the expositions of Cassiodore and Haymo have already been given. Rémi's *Enarrationes* will be found, Migne, CXXXI, 133-844, Bruno's *Expositio*, Migne, CXLII, 39-530. Wichmann (p. 46) cites Smaragdus among the authors of the Psalm commentaries, but no work of this description has come down to us under his name.

This error is committed, also, by J. Bochiuss, whose *Psalmorum Davidis Parodia Heroica*, Antwerp, 1608, contains the best list I have seen of the ancient commentators on the Psalms.

exhibit a parallelism to the corresponding interpretations of the Paris Psalter, because they strengthen the proofs already supplied from the parallel passages from St. Augustine's *Enarrationes*, the *Breviarium in Psalmos*, and the pseudo-Bede that the interpolations of the Anglo-Saxon translator, especially in the case of allegorical interpretations, which are the instances of chief demonstrative weight, were drawn from the common stock of Psalm interpretation which was current in the Medieval Church. I shall only reproduce examples of coincident interpretation in the case of passages for which Wichmann has not already cited parallels from the two great sources of medieval Psalm commentaries mentioned above, namely, St. Augustine's *Enarrationes* and the pseudo-Jerome's *Breviarium in Psalmos*. Nothing new was gained from Haymo's commentary, so the following quotations are exclusively from Cassiodore, Rémi, and Bruno of Würzburg, with one or two trifling exceptions from other sources¹ indicated in the proper

¹ Before discovering the connection of the Paris Psalter with the pseudo-Bede, I had been inclined to suspect that the expansions which are found in the body of the Anglo-Saxon translation were due to what is, perhaps, the most widespread of all sources of corruption in texts—namely, the taking over into the translated text of glosses from the MS. which the translator had before him. Glossed Latin Psalters were of such common use in the Middle Ages that it is *a priori* not improbable that the translator should have selected one for his work. I was all the more strongly inclined to this suspicion, inasmuch as the Middle English prose version of the Psalms is known to have suffered corruption through just this influence of a glossed original (s. *The Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter*, edited by Karl D. Bülbring, London, 1891, E. E. T. S., No. 97, Preface, XI). Acting on this supposition, I examined the only specimens of Latin glossed Psalters antedating the Paris Psalter accessible to me, namely, Royal MS., 2BV. and Additional MS. 18043, of the British Museum. Neither of these, however, contained the originals of our expansions. I made a collection of parallels from glosses in these MSS. to expanded passages in the Anglo-Saxon texts, but a more intimate acquaintance with the ancient commentaries later on taught me that the glosses in question were obviously drawn from the best known of the patristic expositions of the Psalms. For instance, Additional 18043 is especially dependent on the *Breviarium in Psalmos* and Royal 2BV. on Augustine and Cassiodore. I may say, in conclusion, that a comparison with the *Glossa Ordinaria* of Walafridus Strabo was unexpectedly quite barren of results.

place. The reader will observe no greater freedom in the expression of the thought with which tradition supplied the translator than has already been remarked in the case of the paraphrase of the arguments of the pseudo-Bede.

Ps. XIV, 2: þa andswarode Drihten þæs witgan mode, þurh onbryrdnesse þæs halgan gastes; and cwæð se witga. = Remigius, 211, B: Responsio Domini Patris.

Ps. XVI, 2: and [þu] me sude mid þam fyre monegra earfoða = Remigius, 218, C: igne id est, valida tribulatione. Cf. St. Augustine, Migne, XXXVI, 143.

Ps. XVI, 10: þa eagan heora modes habbað geteohhad þæt hi me gebygen oð eorðan = Remigius, 220, D: oculos suos: mentem qua divinitatem quæ in me operabatur videre debuerunt, *statuerunt*, id est, firmiter proposuerunt *declinare*, id est, deorsum inclinare in terram, id est, corpus meum.

Ps. XVII, 7: þæt is þæt mægen minra ofermodena feonda = Remigius, 227, B: montes, id est, superbi hujus sæculi. So St. Augustine, p. 149.

Ps. XVIII, 7: ægðer ge modes ge lichaman = Remigius, 241, B: *oculos* interioris hominis.

Ps. XXI, 10: þæt synt lytle and niwe fynd = Remigius, 253, C: lasciviens plebs Judaica.

þæt synt strengran fynd = tauri Principes Judæorum.

Ps. XXI, 15: þæt ys min mægn and mine getrywan frynd, þam ic getruwode swa wel swa minum agenun limum = Cassiodorus, 161, A: Dinumerata sunt etiam ossa ejus, id est, Apostoli sive reliqui Christiani quando persecutione facta . . . quærebantur exstingui.

It is only desired here to show that the general method of interpretation is the same.

Ps. XXV, 6: þæt is þæt ic wære unscyldig betwuh him = Remigius, 273, A: *lavabo inter innocentes manus meas*, imitando innocentes et hoc modo ens inter eos.

Ps. XXVI, 16: gepola Drihtnes willan = Remigius, 278, D: *Sustine Dominum*, pondus præceptorum Domini.

Ps. XXX, 22: ægðer ge modes ge lichaman = Remigius, 296, D: in abditu faciei tuæ id est, intus in corde.

Ps. XXXVI, 9: Forþæm þa þe yfel doð and þæt ne betað = *Breviarium* (to Ps. V, 5), 850, C: Non dixit qui operati sunt iniquitatem sed operantur iniquitatem. Qui perseverant in peccato, illi odio habentur a Domino, dimiserunt illi amantur a Deo.

Ps. XXXVI, 20: þa ryhtwisan syllað ægðer ge to borge ge to gife = Remigius, 336, B: da pauperi qui tibi non solvere potest: et accipe Dominum fidei jussorem et magnum tibi crescit fenus.

Ps. XXXVII, 7: min lichama is full flæschiera lusta = Bruno, 163, B: Illusionibus illis confitetur se pœnitens esse repletum atque infirmatum quibus diabolus humanum genus quotidie illicit et suadet ut delinquat.

Ps. XXXIX, 8: On forewardre þyssere bec ys awriten be me and eac on manegum oðrum = Bruno, 171, B: In capite libri scriptum est de me; in libro isto Psalmorum: then cites first verses of the Gospel of St. John and of Genesis as other illustrations of the text.

Ps. XLIII, 10: And we þa heredon God ælce dæge, and we wæron eac geherede fram oðrum þeodum for his weorcum = Cassiodorus, 312, C: Sed ne crederes otiosos futuros, qui se in Deo dixerunt *esse laudandos*, profitentur se quoque præconia Domini jugiter personare.

Ps. XLIV, 7: þæt ys þæt hy oðer twega, oððe on andetnesse gefeallað, oððe on helle = Cassiodorus, 322, A: *Populi sub te cadent*, conversiones significat hominum: quando credentes in humilitatem feliciter cadunt qui prius vitio præsumptionis erecti sunt.

Ps. XLIV, 8: seo gerecð ælne mann, oððe to ðinum willan oððe to wite = Cassiodorus, 322, C: virga ista justos regit, impios percutit.

Ps. XLIV, 12: þæt synd yfelwillende menn and unðeawas . . . þæt ys deofol = Remigius, 380, D: carnalia constituta vel populum Babylonix, cui populo rex fuit diabolus.

Ps. XLIV, 13 : þæt synt þa sawla þe beoð gewelgode mid goodum geearnincum = Cassiodorus, 326, A : sed *flidarum* istius vocabulo civitatis animas mavult significare fidelium.

Ps. XLV, 3 : þa up-ahafenan kynincgas = Remigius, 383, B: montes, principes terreni.

Ps. XLV, 4 : forþam ne wyrð seo burh næfre onwend, þa hwile þe God byð unonawendlic on hire midle = Remigius, 383, B: Quia *Deus* est in *medio* . . . licet montes conturbentur, *non commovebitur* civitas ipsa a prædicatione Evangelii.

Ps. XLV, 8 : þa andswarode God þæs witgan mode and cwæð eft þurh þone witgan = Bruno, 192, B: Hunc versiculum loquuntur filii Core (Vulgate title) ex persona Domini.

Ps. XLVIII, 18 : Forþæm þe he nyste him nænne ðanc, ne Gode ne mannum þæs ðe he him sealde syððan he hit hæfde : butan þa ane hwile, þe hit him man sealde = Glossed Psalter (British Museum) Royal 2BV : mali tunc Dominum benedicunt quando temporalia bona percipiunt et cum diripiunt.

It will be observed that taking those instances in the Anglo-Saxon version in which the language of the psalms is mystically interpreted, only three (Ps. XXXI, 7, XLI, 8, XLIV, 16) remain unrepresented by parallels in the lists of examples which have been given by Wichmann and myself. It would be useless to examine more closely the reason of this insignificant number of departures, inasmuch as there is no reason to believe that the translator drew directly, or systematically, at any rate, from any commentary, and by an occasional slip of memory, when he thought it worth while to add an explanation of what seemed to him to have been expressed mystically by the psalmist, he would be thrown upon the resources of his own invention. Not only, however, are the instances of mystical interpretation almost without exception now provided with parallels from the writings of the Fathers in the above lists, but a very large number, also, of cases in which the expansion springs from an endeavor on the part of the translator to develop the meaning of his original according to the literal sense.

Authorship.

In view of the results of the comparisons which have just been presented I think we are no longer justified in clinging to the theory of Alfredian authorship for the Anglo-Saxon translation. After the preceding investigation, it is true, there can be no room left for doubt that in executing the body of the version, the translator worked with only rare consultation of commentaries, if any. But the assumption which runs through the whole of Wichmann's treatment of the subject, that, such being the case, the author could not have been an ecclesiastic (cf. especially pp. 81 and 88) is obviously unwarranted. In the first place it might be remarked that as a matter of fact, as has been shown above, the translator did, after all, use a commentary for the prefaces to the psalms, and the reason for his not drawing upon the same commentary for his interpolations will be considered in a moment. But to satisfy oneself that the assumption referred to is untenable, it is only necessary to recall that the metrical division of the Paris Psalter is notoriously deformed by more flagrant errors of translation than the division now under consideration (s. Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 436), though the same resource of consulting commentaries was also open to its author. It will hardly be maintained, however, that this version which, as is known (s. Bouterwek, *Caedmon's Biblische Dichtungen*, p. CLXXXIII), was in use in the liturgy of the Anglo-Saxon Church was not of purely ecclesiastical origin. The fact, then, that the translator occasionally blundered instead of consulting the commentaries is clearly no obstacle to an acceptance of the natural supposition that he was a member of one of the ecclesiastical orders. On the other hand, the general familiarity with allegorical interpretation which he is proved by our parallels to have possessed, notwithstanding his independence of any particular commentary, would be incomprehensible on the supposition of this version having been the work of a layman, even though the layman should be King

Alfred. If we leave aside the prefaces I can subscribe with little reservation to Wichmann's opinion (p. 49), that the interpolations of the text represent simply what the author had gathered by hearing and reading. But that any one save a churchman by profession should have carried in his head so considerable a mass of interpretation in detail—often agreeing exactly with that of leading commentaries (cf., for instance, Ps. 7, 12 ff., 44, 10)—seems, indeed, inconceivable.

The character of these interpolations points, moreover, to the same conclusion. Who does not recognize in the following insertion at Ps. 48, 7, the note of the professional monk or priest? The verse in the Latin original runs, "Frater non redimit; redimet homo; non dabit Deo placationem suam; et pretium redemptionis animæ suæ, nec laborabit in æternum et vivet in finem." These words are rendered by the Anglo-Saxon, "þæt nan broðor oðres sawle nele alysan of helle ne ne mæg, þeah he wylle, gif he sylf nanwuht nyle, ne ne deð to goode þa hwile þe he her byð." Then comes immediately the following sermonizing interpolation which, it will be found impossible, I think, to impute to King Alfred. "Gylde forþy him sylf, and alyse his sawle, þa hwile þe he her sy; forþam se broðor oððe nyle, oððe ne mæg, gif he sylf na ne onginð to tilianne þæt he þæt weorð agife to alysnesse his sawle; ac þæt ys wyrse þæt full neah ælc mann þæs tiolað, fram þæm anginne his lifes, oð þæne ende hu he on ecesse swincan mæge."

Let us now consider, however, the motives which prevented the translator from using for text as well as for prefaces the commentary which he has been proved to have used for the latter.

It might first be asked, may not the originals of the latter alone—that is the arguments of *Exegesis* only—have been accessible to him? may these not have existed independently of the commentary to which we now find them attached? I should see no reason for hesitating to give a negative answer to this question. As we have seen, the very condition of the

arguments reaching England was their becoming a part of the pseudo-Bede. That they ever existed apart from this commentary in England we have not the slightest ground for believing, since they have been found nowhere save in connection with this work, and if, indeed, they had ever existed apart from it there, it could only have been in connection with another commentary or glossed Psalter. At least, I am unaware of the existence in the Middle Ages of separate collections of such arguments, whereas somewhat similar *proemia* of an orthodox character are occasionally found in the Church commentaries, e. g., the *Breviarium in Psalmos*. But we have seen that the Anglo-Saxon version is not less independent of the other commentators than of the author of the pseudo-Bede itself; hence, there is no reason for supposing that the arguments were ever united with any other exposition of the Psalms than that to which we now find them attached.

The true explanation of the translator's working independently of the commentaries in the body of his text is to be sought not so much in his total ignorance of these aids as in the practical nature of the object he proposed to himself. This object evidently was to furnish a plain rendering of the Psalter into English speech, and it is only sporadically and without system that on comparatively rare occasions he has inserted bits of allegorical or other interpretation, as they occurred to him. That he should have now and then committed blunders in turning the Latin original into his own language when the commentaries would have set him right, is to be considered the result either of his own indolence or over-confidence or of the inaccessibility of such works to him at the time of his encountering the difficulties in question. At the same time it cannot but occur to any one who is familiar with the patristic expositions, that it is not singular, after all, that a person pursuing the practical object indicated above should have rarely sought assistance from this quarter. The interpretation according to the literal sense, which alone could have been of use to the translator, did not lie within the scope of these works, and

it is only by a process of inference, not always easy, that the reader is able to discover from the allegorical interpretation of a passage what was the commentator's interpretation of its simple sense. On the other hand, the arguments of *Exegesis* were made use of by the translator, since it seemed particularly desirable in a work of the character he had in hand that the interpretation of each psalm should be indicated succinctly by such introductory prefaces as we find in the prose division of the Paris Psalter. His choice of the pseudo-Bede may have been determined either by accident or, more probably, by the fact that the arguments of this commentary in the form we have it offer a greater variety of matter than can be found in the case of the other patristic commentaries, in which, for the rest, prefaces to the psalms of any sort, though they occur, are exceptional.

With the above paragraphs I should conclude my observations on the question of authorship for the prose division of the Paris Psalter as distinct from that of date of composition, but as Wichmann (pp. 84-95) has cited and discussed at some length a number of passages in the Anglo-Saxon translation, characterized either by expansions or mistranslations, from which he draws the inference of Alfredian authorship for this work, it will be necessary for me to prolong the present discussion somewhat in order to submit the evidence of the passages concerned to a reëxamination. I will omit in the following those passages in which Wichmann has been at some pains to show from the errors of the translator that he did not have recourse to the commentaries in the performance of his work, inasmuch as this question may now be regarded, I think, as finally settled. The inference, however, which in each instance he draws from this fact—namely, the inference that the author of the translation was, therefore, a layman—is altogether unwarrantable, as I have pointed out above by means of the parallel metrical version of Ps. 51-150. The passages in question I will take up in the order of Wichmann's discussion.

Ps. 5, 8.—We have here in the Anglo-Saxon the gloss inserted: *se weg is min weorc*.—Wichmann cites as parallel from King Alfred's translation of the *Cura Pastoralis*, 266, 3 a similar gloss to *weg*. But the parallel is without force, as the gloss *opera* for *via* in the Latin commentaries and glossed Psalters is, perhaps, the commonest of all glosses. For instance, with reference to this very verse of Ps. 5, we find in *Exegesis*, 509, D. the comment, "Deduc me, inquam, et ita hoc agas ut dirigas viam meam, id est, directa facies opera mea." In the glossed Psalter, Additional MS. 18043 (British Museum) we find again to the verse the gloss: *cujus viæ, id est, opera*. It is useless to adduce the numberless examples that might be added to the above.

Ps. 7, 12–13.—*Et in ipso paravit vasa mortis, sagittas suas ardentibus effecit* = *he teohað þæt he scyle sceotan þæt deaðes fæt [þæt synt þa unrihtwisan he gedeð his flan fyrena ðæt he mæge mid sceotan] and bænnan þa þe her byrnað on wrænesse and on unðeawum*.

It is difficult to see for what purpose Wichmann (p. 85) has cited the two passages from the *Cura Pastoralis*, 76, 1 ff., 360, 16. These are both close translations of the corresponding passages of their Latin originals and the *Domini vasa* of that text have nothing to do with the *vasa mortis* of the Psalmist. The allegorical interpretation of the word *vasa* even is different in the two cases. It is evident, however, that the glossator here followed the interpretation of the *Breviarium in Psalmos* which he had in mind, beginning with verse 12, where he interprets the subject of the Latin *vibrabit* as the devil. The author of the *Breviarium* begins his interpretation of the passage with the words: "*Iste locus duplicem recipit intelligentiam*" (p. 836, C), then cites only one interpretation for verse 12 (p. 836, D), namely, "*nisi egeritis pœnitentiam, Dominus vos gladio suo percutiet*," but in the gloss to verse 15 (same page) the alternative interpretation appears: "*hoc est nisi conversi fueritis, nisi egeritis pœnitentiam, semper diabolus paratum habet arcum, emittit sagittas quibus nos pereutiat*,

etc." The alternative interpretation is carried through in Additional MS. 18043 just as in the Anglo-Saxon; the glosses of that manuscript, as has already been remarked elsewhere, are largely drawn from the *Breviarium in Psalmos*. We find in it no comment immediately after *vibravit*, but after the words: *arcum suum tetendit et paravit illum*, occurs the gloss: "De diabolo ista dicuntur, quia nisi conversi penitentiam egerimus, gladium malitiarum suarum vibravit ad percutiendum nos, quia semper habet arcum paratum insidiarum suarum, de quo emittit sagittas tam per se quam per sua membra quibus nos vulneret ut interficiat. Hoc sunt mortiferæ et venenosæ suasiones quæ et vasa mortis dicuntur." As gloss to the words: *sagittas suas ardentibus effecit*, Additional MS. 18043 has again (following the *Breviarium*): "Et pulchre dixit ardentibus quorum enim corda ardent libidine ceterisque vitiis." There follows then in this manuscript the alternative interpretation of verses 12-13, according to which the subject of *vibravit* is *Dominus*, and *gladius* is Christ.

Ps. 10, 5.—As gloss to *bræwas* translating the Latin *palpebræ* the Anglo-Saxon adds: *þæt ys rihta dom*. Again, the parallel which Wichmann adduces from *Cura Pastoralis*, 192, 25 ff. is beside the purpose, inasmuch as the passage quoted simply offers a translation of the corresponding sentences of its Latin original. Whatever likeness there may exist in the two cases is between the Latin originals, in the first instance, and is, of course, bound under any circumstances to be reflected in accurate translations of these. Evidently the Anglo-Saxon gloss is based on the interpretation found in the *Breviarium*, p. 846, A, and repeated, I may say, in Additional MS. 18043. I quote the gloss from the latter for this passage: "In palpebris: vel ipsi oculi quorum sunt pars, id est, subtilitas iudiciorum Dei quibus aliis aperit, aliis claudit intelligitur."

Ps. 15, 2.—One will easily grant that the Anglo-Saxon interpretation of this passage rests upon "ein gedanke, der einem könige am besten in den mund gelegt wird," for, as the introduction to the psalm shows, the translator interpreted

it as a psalm of King David: þone fiteoðan sealm Daid sang be his earfoðum, ægðer ge modes ge lichaman, etc.

Ps. 15, 5.—The circumstance just pointed out explains the translation of *hæreditatem* and *hæreditas* by *land and rice* in this verse.

Ps. 17, 7.—*Fundamenta montium conturbata sunt* = se grundweall þara munta wæs tohrered [þæt is þæt mægen minra ofermodena feonda].—I do not see that there is any misunderstanding of the text, the translator only takes *montes* in an allegorical sense as the medieval commentators were in the habit of doing. Surely, if once *montes* were generally interpreted *superbi* or *principes superbi* (*Exegesis*, 569 f.) it is not strange that *fundamenta* should be interpreted by *mægn* = might. These *superbi* would have to be enemies from the context. It would seem more natural in the case of such a passage as the present that the author, if not an ecclesiastic, should not have thought of allegorical interpretation at all, for none was needed for the understanding of the passage. Wichmann, besides, makes the gratuitous assumption (p. 86) that a monk would have certainly followed the commentators and interpreted the passage as having reference to the crucifixion of Christ. But allegorical interpretations are altogether a secondary matter with the translator. The whole psalm represents the rescue of David through the aid of Jehovah and has been rendered with this understanding by the Anglo-Saxon. It is difficult to conceive how else with his practical object in view it could have been rendered. The citation of the passage from the *Cura Pastoralis*, 310, 8 is again without weight, since the Anglo-Saxon words there: Ða weallas ðonne Hierusalem getacniað ða mægenu ðære saule, are simply a literal translation of the Latin original: *Muri autem Jerusalem virtutes sunt animæ* (Migne, LXXVII, 81, C).

Ps. 17, 28.—Again to Wichmann's objection that *murum* is translated literally without mystical explanation (p. 87), it is to be replied that in a translation in which throughout, in accordance with its plan, so little commentary is mingled, we

have no right to base an argument as to authorship on the absence of such an explanation. The Anglo-Saxon translation is just as easily understood as the original Hebrew.

Ps. 18, 12.—*Si mei non fuerint dominati, tunc immaculatus ero, et emundabor a delicto maximo* = Gif mine fynd ne ricsiað ofer me, þonne beo ic unwemme, and beo geclænsod from þæm mæstum scyldum [ac gif hi me abysgiað, þonne ne mæg ic smeagan mine unscylda, ne eac þinne willan ne mæg smeagan to wyrcanne].—The Anglo-Saxon translator has certainly misunderstood his original here, but the mistake is due to the reading *dominati*. Having once been involved in error, in order to make the sense of the passage clear, according to his conception of it, he was compelled to add in explanation the words contained in brackets. It is wrong, however, to say that the translator conceives the deliverance *a maximo delicto* as “befreiung von weltlichen, die persönliche freiheit bedrohenden feinden” (p. 87). The deliverance from enemies to which the Anglo-Saxon refers is implied in *Si mei non fuerint dominati*, not in *emundabor a delicto maximo*. We have no right, moreover, to assume with Wichmann (*ib.*) in consequence of this addition, “ac gif . . . to wyrcanne,” that the translator, himself, considered personal liberty indispensable for self-probation and execution of the divine will. The addition was made not to express any personal view of the translator. It was only the logical consequence of his misunderstanding of *si mei non fuerint dominati*. Last of all, the psalm is conceived as the psalm of King David and the mistake in translation was all the more easy from that conception.

The Anglo-Saxon is not the only commentator who had been misled by *dominati*. Cf. Haymo, Migne, CXVI, 257, D.

For an expansion similar to that in this passage see Ps. 39, 14.

Ps. 39, 1.—*Et eduxit me de lacu miseriæ et de luto fæcis* = and alædde me fram þam pytte ælcra yrmða and of þam duste and of þam drosnum ælces þeowdomes and ælcra hæftnyde.—The Anglo-Saxon has here very naturally rendered *de lacu*

miseriae et de luto faecis by terms denoting servitude and captivity, since according to the introduction that goes immediately before (following his authority, the Theodorean argument of the pseudo-Bede) he conceived the psalm as one which was sung by the captive Israelites in Babylon. It is unnecessary, then, to resort to the idea of a layman translator to explain the turn of phrase—as we have here simply an application of the conception which the commentary supplied.

Ps. 21, 15.—*Foderunt manus meas et pedes meos, dinumeraverunt omnia ossa mea.*—Wichmann (p. 88) objects that the Anglo-Saxon gloss to the above sentence: *þæt ys min mægn and mine getrywan frynd, ðam ic getruwode, swa wel swa minum agenum limum*, shows that the translator applied these words to himself. This is obviously incorrect, however. The translator only follows his usual custom of interpreting in the person of King David, the assumed author of all the psalms, and according to the particular supposed circumstances of its composition. The Anglo-Saxon introduction to this psalm is lost, but the argument in the pseudo-Bede gives the clue to its interpretation: “*Rogat Dominum David factione Absalom laborans.*” The interpretation of the translator agrees very well with the period of Absalom’s rebellion, if we suppose that he had the historical interpretation of the argument in mind.

Ps. 39, 2.—To Wichmann’s criticism of this passage (p. 88), it is again to be repeated that it was not the purpose of the translator to suggest allegorical interpretations. He only gives a literal interpretation of figurative phrases, probably, also, with especial reference to the authorship of the psalm and the circumstances under which it was sung as explained in the introductions.

Et statuit super petram pedes meos = and he asette mine fet on swiðe heanne stan [*þæt ys on swyðe heah setl and on swyðe fæstne anweald*].

The *heah setl* could only be the seat of a royal personage, of course, but David is the King that the translator has in mind.

To turn the employment of such a word into an argument for royal authorship seems to verge closely on the absurd.

Ps. 13, 6.—Equally trivial seem Wichmann's reasons for regarding the use of *for yflum willum* as an indication of non-clerical authorship. Such superfluous clauses are constantly added by the translator—but it is useless to argue upon evidence of this sort, which is too ridiculously slight to support an inference in favor of the one view or the other. Similarly with regard to *yrfeweard* instead of *laf*, translating *reliquiae* (Ps. 36, 36–37). If monks did not have heirs, themselves, there was certainly nothing to prevent them from knowing that other men had them.

Ps. 46, 9.—*þa ealdormen ealre eorðan becumað to Abrahames Gode and beoð him underðyde; forþam he oferswiðde þa strangan kynincgas ofer eorðan, þa þe wæron upahafene swa þas godas.* With these words Wichmann (p. 92) compares a passage from Alfred's translation of Augustine's *Soliloquies*, fol. 44 a: *he wealt þara cyninga ðe mæstne anweald habbað þisses middangeardes, ða beoð eallum mannum gelice acende and æac oðrum mannum gelice sweltað; þa læt he ricsian ða hwile, þe he wyle.* The resemblance, however, between the passages is too distant to possess any significance. The thought is a commonplace one and what is most distinctive of each passage *þa þe wæron upahafene swa þas godas* in the Psalms, and *ða beoð eallum mannum gelice sweltað* in the *Soliloquies*, finds no representative in the other.

Ps. 48, 7–8.—The passage from the *Cura Pastoralis*, 338, 8 (quoted p. 93) has no demonstrative weight, because it is simply a rendering of the corresponding Latin of Gregory, Migne, LXXVII, 88, A: "*Hinc enim Psalmista ait, non dabit Deo propitiationem suam, nec pretium redemptionis animæ suæ. Pretium namque redemptionis dare est opus bonum præveni-enti nos gratiæ reddere. Hinc Joannes exclamat dicens: Jam securis ad radicem arboris posita est. Omnis arbor quæ non facit fructum bonum excidetur et in ignem mittetur* (Luc., III, 9 (sic). Qui ergo se innoxios quia aliena non rapiunt æsti-

mant ictum securis vicinæ prævideant, et torporem improvidæ securitatis amittant, ne cum ferre fructum boni operis negligunt, a præsentī vita funditus quasi a viriditate radicis exsecentur.”

Finally, Wichmann (p. 93 f.) quotes a number of passages from the Psalms which occur in the Anglo-Saxon version of the *Cura Pastoralis*, as offering parallels to the corresponding passages in the Paris Psalter. These parallels, however, are altogether without weight. It would be strange, indeed, if two fairly accurate renderings of the same words in the same language, whether executed by two different persons or the same person, did not betray “ein deutliches zusammenklingen.” It is unfair, moreover, to draw into the comparison the versions of Spelman’s Psalter (*Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus, a Johanne Spelmanno . . . editum*, etc., London, 1640) in order to make a point of the relatively closer agreement of the Paris Psalter with the translations of the *Cura Pastoralis*. The Psalter which Spelman has edited is simply an interlinear version. According to its plan, the Anglo-Saxon equivalent of each Latin word is set over that word in the order of the original, so that it is seriously misleading to print words thus disjoined (so Wichmann does in the notes to p. 94) as if they constituted sentences in an Anglo-Saxon translation of the ordinary form, such as those of the Paris Psalter and the *Cura Pastoralis*. Against this procedure Spelman, himself, had given the warning: “Monendus es autem, Lector, non hic reperiri integrum aut genuinum sermonis Saxonici contextum, sed ad singula verba Latina, verbales tantummodò Versiones, in quibus a linguæ illius proprietate necessario sæpè disceditur” (s. Preface). This plan of Spelman’s Psalter explains why each word of the Latin is rendered simply by a single equivalent in the Anglo-Saxon—in contrast to the frequent renderings by two synonyms in the Paris Psalter and *Cura Pastoralis* in accordance with *linguæ illius proprietas*. This contrast might tend to produce a false notion of the cause of the

comparative agreement between the Paris Psalter and the *Cura Pastoralis*.¹

Date of Composition.

In the section of his article devoted to a presentation of what is characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon version of Ps. 1-50 in phonology and inflections (pp. 53-63), Wichmann has endeavored to detect in the great mass of forms evidence to support the suggestion of Prof. Wülker, *Grundriss*, p. 436,—for it is hardly more—that the version in question is the work of King Alfred. Wichmann has not, himself, offered any summary of the linguistic evidence which he supposes to afford confirmation of that suggestion, although he makes the general remark at the close of this division of his work that “die häufigen, an ältere zeit erinnernden laut- und formgestalten erheben die vermutung Wülker’s . . . zu immer grösserer wahrscheinlichkeit” (p. 63). On a careful examination of the whole discussion embraced in the pages cited above, the following eleven points, relating, partly, to phonology and, partly, to the system of inflectional forms appear from the accompanying remarks to constitute the basis of the statement just quoted.

(1) The occasional occurrence of *o* before nasals instead of *a*

¹ I will refrain from discussing the laborious comparison of the vocabulary of our text with that of King Alfred’s various translations which Wichmann has made, pp. 71-79. It seems to me impossible to draw any conclusion from such comparisons—at least, I can recall no instance where the vocabulary test as distinguished from that of phraseology has been found to prove anything. This so-called test has never enjoyed any favor outside of Germany and I think the signs are not wanting that its popularity there is on the wane. At any rate, in the present instance, after all his labor, Wichmann, himself, has not made the slightest attempt to point out in what respect the results of his comparisons tell in favor of Alfredian authorship. One may say, also, of the points of phraseology and diction discussed on pp. 66-71, 80, 83 f., what Fritsche observed in a similar case many years ago, *Anglia*, II, 453, that, if they prove anything, it is simply that the text was composed in the same period as those with which it is compared. As a matter of fact, there are none of the words and phrases or peculiarities of translation cited by Wichmann which do not, also, occur—in many cases, abundantly—outside of the works of Alfred.

which is customary in late West-Saxon usage (s. p. 53). (2) *a* unbroken six times before *l* + consonant (p. 54). (3) The occurrence three times of the form *meahte* instead of *mihhte*. Reference to Wichmann's citations will show that *ea* for *i* before *h* occurs in our text only in the case of this one word (p. 54). (4) *e* instead of *i* as a middle vowel in forms like *manege*, *elðeodegum*, etc., twenty times in all, where the late West-Saxon usage requires *i* (p. 54). (5) The form *weoruld* instead of *woruld*, which latter, according to Wichmann's statement, was exclusively used in the language of Aelfric; *weoruld* occurs in our text fourteen times against *woruld*, nine times (p. 54). (6) Our text occasionally preserves the distinctive forms of the accusatives singular of feminines of the *i*-declension, which in the older West-Saxon were without endings—in the later West-Saxon adopted the *-e* of the *a*-stems (p. 57). (7) The occurrence three times of the ending *-a* for the nominative, accusative plural of the feminine adjective (strong declension). The forms concerned are *manega*, twice, *mistlica*, once. The masculine ending in the late West-Saxon takes the place of the feminine (p. 58). (8) Our text frequently shows older *-u*, *-o* as ending of the nom. and acc. plural of the neuter of adjectives, whereas the late West-Saxon has the ending *-e* (p. 59). (9) The extremely frequent occurrence of *ðam* instead of late West-Saxon *ðan*, especially in the combination *forðam* (p. 59 f.). (10) The almost regular syncopation of *e* in the endings of the 2. and 3. pers. sing. indic. The fuller forms are characteristic of late West-Saxon (p. 60). (11) The frequent mutation of the radical vowel in the 2. and 3. pers. sing. present indic. In this particular our text agrees more closely with the older usage.

I do not add to the above Wichmann's observations (p. 55) on the occurrence of *y* and its earlier equivalents in our text, as he, himself, has made no attempt to draw an inference in favor of a more ancient date for our version from the facts of this occurrence, as these facts, indeed, do not admit of any such inference.

It is in the eleven points which have just been enumerated, as far as I can discover, that Wichmann believes he has discerned survivals of forms of the West-Saxon dialect of more ancient date in the midst of the language of the eleventh century into which the original language of the translation, as a whole, has been subsequently turned by successive scribes. Whatever opinion, however, one may hold on other grounds as to the date of the translation of the prose psalms, little force, I think, can be conceded to the observations of Wichmann which have just been presented, since, as I shall now proceed to show, every one of the peculiarities of language enumerated can be matched from MSS. of documents that had no existence before the latter half of the tenth century. The task of making good this assertion would, doubtless, be far easier if we had for the literary monuments of the later West-Saxon periods generally, full indices of forms such as are supplied for the *Blickling Homilies*, for example, in Dr. Morris' edition. In the absence, however, of such indices, I have, myself, examined with the above purpose in view two of the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, namely, St. Matthew and St. Luke—St. Mark and St. John not being accessible to me at the time of writing—and the prose versions of the Benedictine Rule. The edition of St. Matthew which I have used is the Cambridge edition by Skeat—of St. Luke the recent edition by Bright (*The Gospel of St. Luke in Anglo-Saxon*, edited by James W. Bright, Oxford, 1893)—and of the Benedictine Rule Schröer's edition (Grein-Wülker's *Bibliothek der Angelsächsischen Prosa*, Band II). My citations from these works do not pretend to represent exhaustively the occurrence of the forms in question, but show all the more clearly on this account, I believe, that no inference which requires us to set the composition of our translation before the middle of the tenth century can be drawn from the linguistic peculiarities of the text which Wichmann has noted.

I shall now simply present instances of parallel occurrence from the documents mentioned with as little comment

as possible, the same order being followed as in the above enumeration.

(1) *o* instead of *a* before nasals is common in the Benedictine Rule. For example, on the first two or three pages we find *mynstermonna*, 9, 1. *monna*, 9, 23. 10, 5. *noman*, 10, 11. 11, 11. *lichoman*, 16, 22. 18, 12. (2) Unbroken *a* in *anwald* occurs frequently in Luke, e. g., 20, 2, 8, 20. 21, 27. 23, 7. (3) The preterite of *magan* occurs rarely in the Benedictine Rule. Among variants, however, at the bottom of the page I have noted *meahte* at 19, 7. 32, 2., so twice against Wichmann's three times in the Paris Psalter (prose version). (4) *e* as middle vowel instead of *i* occurs in the gospels times without number. See Luke, *menegum*, 3, 7. *menegu*, 3, 10. 5, 1. *halegum*, 1, 41, 67, 70. 4, 34. *et passim*. (5) *weoruld* for *woruld*. The word is not of frequent occurrence in the texts I am citing from, but *weoruldwilningum* is found in the Benedictine Rule at 17, 4. and I have observed no other occurrence of *weoruld* or *woruld* in or out of composition in that text. Compare, also, *weoruldwelan* Matthew, 6, 24. Luke, 16, 11. (6) Accusatives singular of feminines of the *i*-declension without the ending *-e* occur, also, in the Benedictine Rule and even later West-Saxon texts; so, *tid*, 17, 23 (variant). 72, 12, 13, 14. So *wurðmynt*, Aelfric's *Nativitas Sanctæ Mariæ*, 2. (7) The form *mistlica* is, most probably, used simply by analogy to *manega* on account of the similarity of meaning, so, only the latter is to be considered here. But even if it were true that the correct feminine plural ending, nom. and acc., of the strong adjective did not occur sporadically in genuine late West-Saxon texts, the form, *manega*, here would prove nothing, inasmuch it occurs indifferently in connection with nom. and acc. pl. of masculines, feminines and neuters in the later West-Saxon. For *manega* as acc. pl. masc. see Matthew, 3, 7., as nom. pl. masc. Matthew, 9, 10. 13, 17., as nom. pl. neuter see Paris Psalter, itself, 33, 19. 44, 15. Examples could be multiplied, as it is, perhaps, needless to say, from other texts but these are sufficient. (8) The occurrence of the old nom. acc. pl. neuter

ending of the adjective, *-u* or *-o*, might seem to have more weight than the peculiarities that have as yet been taken up, but as the ending *-u* had a strong enough hold on existence to become attached in the later West-Saxon even to the long stems to which it did not properly belong (s. Sievers, 293, n. 1), it is not surprising that we should occasionally find it added in cases where its addition would have been unobjectionable even according to the older usage. (9) That we should find *forðam* almost regularly rather than *forðan* in our text is no indication whatever of older composition. This is the form habitually employed, one may say, in the Gospels. For instance, in the Corpus MS. of St. Matthew, V, 3-10, we find *forðam* recurring eight times in as many lines, and so throughout this Gospel and St. Luke. (10) The syncopation of *e* in the ending of 2. and 3. pers. sing. indic. pres. is, likewise, the rule in the Gospels. Almost any page of the Corpus MS. of St. Matthew will offer numerous examples. For instance in a few verses of the Fifth Chapter, *awyrð*, 13, *gewit*, 18, *towyrpð*, *laerð*, 19, *segð*, 22, *brincst*, *geðencgst*, 23, *forlet*, *genimð*, 32, *agylst*, 33, etc. (11) Mutation of the radical vowel in the same forms of the pres. indic. is, again, the rule in the Gospels, so no argument for the early composition of the prose psalms can be based on this observation. The mutation in question is found on almost every page of St. Matthew. The examples given under (10) illustrate it in part, but numberless others could be added. So, *seryt*, 6, 30. *byrð*, 7, 17. *cwyð*, 7, 21. *cræwð*, Luke, 22, 34, etc.

It will be evident from the above, I think that Wichmann's supposed indications of Early West-Saxon origin in the language of our text do not stand the test of an examination. On the other hand, it must be confessed that the style of the translation in its naïveté and awkwardness—traits which become most prominent in those portions of his work where the author has the freest hand, namely, the arguments—is certainly more nearly in the manner of the so-called Alfredian translations than in that of the Benedictine Rule, for instance.

It is, of course, possible that the characteristics of style which have been noted might have sprung from a deficient skill on the part of the translator, to whatever age he belonged, but it is hardly likely that a work of this scope should have been undertaken in the Late West-Saxon period, when an accurate knowledge of Latin had become general among the ecclesiastical orders, by a person who would have been esteemed so unlearned according to the standards of that age as the author of our translation. I know of no method by which the question which has here been raised can be brought to a decision, but as long as translations of the late ninth century exist exhibiting the same naïveté of conception, looseness of syntactical structure and clumsiness of movement as the version with which we are dealing, and none similar for the age to which the language of the text belongs, I should prefer to assign its composition to the earlier period.

An indication pointing to the same conclusion which is, perhaps, not altogether unworthy of consideration may be discovered in certain external characteristics, so to speak, of the Paris Psalter, itself. In the first place the prose and metrical versions of the psalms in this book, of course, did not originally belong together, so that the prose division must have once existed as an independent version—perhaps, still fragmentary—as the metrical division is known to have done. The versions were then brought together by a redactor who arranged each in parallel columns by the side of the corresponding Latin original—the Latin text which he thus uses being different, however, from that which formed the basis of either of the two Anglo-Saxon versions. Recognizing the source of the Anglo-Saxon prefaces to the psalms in the prose version, he inserted as rubrics to the individual psalms in his text passages from this source, running the rubrics, however, derived from the *argumenta* through the metrical version as well. That the person whose knowledge was sufficient for this recognition, or who, at any rate, was learned enough to be acquainted with the Latin commentary in question, should

have transcribed the rubrics in the corrupt and mutilated forms in which we possess them is, of course, incredible. Between the original redaction and the MS. of the Paris Psalter, as we have it, there must have stood, at least, one copyist, or considering the extent and variety of these corruptions, several copyists, I should say. It is, of course, possible that the copies which we are here forced to assume followed upon each other in tolerably quick succession, but I do not believe that this will be generally regarded as likely, and our version would thus be carried back to a period earlier by many years, or, perhaps, even decades, than the date of our MS. Still further to be considered would be the term of independent existence which the prose version, like the metrical, must have already enjoyed for some time.

In view of the above conclusions and secondarily, perhaps, of the collocation of a fragmentary version of the Psalms by William of Malmesbury with the Alfredian cycle of translations, it seems most probable that our version was executed about the same time as these translations. It must be confessed, however, that little weight can be attached to the report of a historian of more than two centuries later in a matter of this kind, where his information is not confirmed by older tradition or direct statement, as is the case with the other translations which are classed as Alfred's. But even in regard to the latter, as the most recent discussion of the Old English Bede sufficiently shows, such testimony is not to be accepted without searching examination and the result of the examination which has been applied to the version here in question has shown, I hope, that, if we, indeed, interpret the report of William of Malmesbury as referring to the fragment preserved in the Paris Psalter, his statement as to its authorship, at least, must be recognized as incorrect.¹

¹ I have not considered in the above the external evidence regarding the date of composition of the prose version, since the only limits which are to be gained from this evidence are too wide to be of any value. The commentary of Ambrose Autpert which furnished the source of the intro-

Summary of Results.

The following is a brief summary of the results established, or believed to be established, by the preceding investigation :

1. The MS. called the Paris Psalter which contains the Anglo-Saxon version of the Psalms was most probably acquired by Jean, Duke of Berry, during his nine years' sojourn as a hostage in England after the Peace of Brétigny (1360). It was certainly in his possession in the year 1402, and was presented by him in 1406 to the canons of his foundation, the Sainte Chapelle at Bourges. It was first described by the Benedictine scholar, Dom Martène, in the *Voyage littéraire de deux Religieux Benedictins*, published in 1717. It passed in the year 1752 into the collection of the Bibliothèque du Roi (now Bibliothèque Nationale) and has remained there ever since.

2. The prose division of the Anglo-Saxon version, embracing Ps. 1-50 (Vulgate numbering) which is found in this MS. was composed most probably in the late ninth or early tenth century. That it is the work of an ecclesiastic is proved by the ample fund of allegorical interpretation which the author had at his command, as appears from a comparison of interpolations in the text with parallels from the early commentators on the Psalms. No systematic—probably, no direct—use, however, has been made of any particular commentary, except for the introductory prefaces to each of the psalms, which are paraphrases of the corresponding *argumenta* of the commentary, *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*. The Latin rubrics which head the metrical as well as prose psalms in the Paris Psalter are drawn from the same source.

3. The Latin Commentary just mentioned, which was incorrectly ascribed to Bede by his early editors, is really the

ductions was written in the latter half of the eighth century, his death occurring in 778. This for the upward limit. The MS. of the Paris Psalter, on the other hand, belongs to the eleventh century,—so, a space of more than two hundred years.

work of the Benedictine commentator, Ambrosius Autpertus, abbot of St. Vincent near the Vultur in Southern Italy who died in the year 778. The *argumenta* to the psalms in this work, excluding the mystical elements, were ultimately derived from the Greek commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Psalms. This is proved by a comparison with the arguments of that commentary which are preserved in the Syriac MS. Sachau, No. 215 of the Royal Library at Berlin, and published by Prof. Friedrich Baethgen in the *Zs. für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, V. The nineteen cases of divergence from the interpretation of the original Greek, observed in groups among the psalms near the beginning and the end are most probably explained by the damaged state of the MS. which the translator of the *argumenta* had access to.

4. The *argumenta* of the commentary, *In Psalmorum Librum Exegesis*, were not inserted by the author of this work, but became attached to it, probably, through the accidental coincidence of his name with that of Ambrose of Milan, to whom the only portions of Theodore's writings that gained circulation in the West were universally attributed. All the circumstances relating to the *argumenta* point strongly to the existence of a Latin version of the whole of Theodore's commentary. This translation was composed, no doubt, in North Africa about the end of the sixth century and passed thence into Southern Italy at a somewhat later period.

APPENDIX.

So obvious is it that the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Psalms was not executed from the particular text of the Latin version which appears arranged side by side with it in the Paris Psalter that the fact revealed itself to Sir Frederic Madden for the prose portion even in the cursory examination which he seems to have given to the edition of Thorpe. I find, for instance, in his copy of this work now in my possession, at Ps. 15, 2, the query, "if the Saxon is not from

another Latin text?" and at Ps. 22, 7, the more positive expression: "The Saxon translator evidently here followed another Latin text which had *populum*, not *poculum*." The same observation was made for the metrical division of the Anglo-Saxon version by Bouterwek, *Angelsächsisches Glossar*, p. xx. In regard to the Latin text actually found in the Paris Psalter Thorpe correctly remarks (Præfatio, VI) that it approaches most nearly the version which is known as the Roman Psalter, and, indeed, I will say, is simply a variety of that version, the mixture of readings from other versions being a well known feature of the ancient Psalters (s. F. Kaulen, *Geschichte der Vulgata*, pp. 225, 229, *et passim*, Mainz, 1868). A notice of its relation to the Roman Psalter is indeed found on the back of the Paris Psalter, itself, expressed in the words which were observed first by the author of the letter-press accompanying Plate CCXXXI of Silvestre's *Paléographie Universelle*, and subsequently by Tanger, *Anglia*, VI, 126: "psalterium in ydiomate peregrino. Istud psalterium dicitur romanum, est tamen in eo ydioma barbarum." Wichmann (pp. 42-44) has already furnished for the prose division in detail the proof that the Anglo-Saxon was not translated from its accompanying Latin text. It only remains for me to confirm by the presentation of similar evidence the observation of Bouterwek to the same effect for the metrical division. The task here is somewhat more difficult owing to the greater freedom of the metrical translation, and, also, owing to a closer correspondence between the Latin text which was used by the author of this division and the Latin text of the Paris Psalter than existed in the case of the prose portion.

My references in the following to the ancient Italic version of the Psalms and to the Gallican Psalter are according to the texts as given in *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae Versiones Antiquae*, ed. P. Sabatier, Vol. II, 9-287, Rheims, 1743 (Itala from MS. Germanense Argenteum, which is now in the National Library at Paris, Par. Lat. 11947. Cf. J. Wordsworth, *Old*

Latin Biblical Texts, No. 1, Appendix I, pp. 49 f.). The Roman Psalter is cited according to the edition of Vallarsi and Maffei (Migne's reprint, *Patrologia Latina*, XXIX, 120–398).

I place the reading of the Latin text which is found in the Paris Psalter first, next the Anglo-Saxon translation and finally the reading of the Roman Psalter.

Ps. 57, 4: quæ non exaudiet vocem incantantium et
venefici incantantis sapienter.

þæt heo nele gehyran heahgaldor sum, þæt
snotre men singað wið attrum.

. . . . et veneficia quæ incantantur a sapiente.

Ps. 65, 3: Psalmum dicam nomine tuo.

eall ðeos eorðe secge geneahhie þæt þin
nama is se hehsta, etc.

psalmum dicat [terra] nomini tuo.

Ps. 76, 2: et nocte coram te.

on niht for him.

et nocte coram eo.

Ps. 77, 62: Et Israel, haereditatem suam, spreuit.

and his yrfe eac eall forhogode.

haereditatem suam spreuit.

Ps. 101, 25: Filii servorum tuorum inhabitabunt ibi, et

semen eorum in seculum seculi.

. . . . and heora sylfra cynn, syððan to feore, on
worulda woruld, well gerehtest.

Et semen eorum in saeculum saeculi dirigitur.

Ps. 106, 38: Vexati sunt a tribulatione dolorum et dolore.

fram þære costunge sares and yfeles þe
hi syððan begeat.

et vexati sunt a tribulatione malorum et dolorum.

Ps. 108, 28: Induantur qui detrahunt me apud Dominum
pudore.

þe me tælnysse, teonan ætfæstan.

Induantur qui detrahunt mihi reverentiam.

Ps. 114, 4: invocabo eigde invocavi.

Ps. 115, 2: Ego dixi in excessu meo.

Swylce ic sylfa cwæð, þa me swa ðuhte on

mod-seofan.

Ego dixi in excessu mentis meae.

Ps. 117, 4: Dicant nunc qui timent Dominum.

Cweðan ealle þæt, unforcuðe, þe him onstandeð.

egsa Drihtne, forðon he ys se goda God.

Dicant nunc omnes qui timent Dominum
quoniam bonus.

Ps. 138, 17: Accipient in vanitate civitates tuas.

Wutun, þurh idel searu, ealle tiligean, þæt
we heora burh tobrecan moton.

accipient in vanitate civitates suas.

Ps. 143, 3: Subjiciens populum meum sub me.

ic hiht on ðe haebbe faeste, þæt þu me folc
mænig fægere under-þeoddest.

Subjiciens populos sub me.¹

It is shown by the passages which have just been quoted that the Anglo-Saxon metrical translation of Ps. 51–150 is not based on the Latin text with which it stands side by side in the MS. The close correspondence, however, which, in the main, exists between the two proves that the text which was actually used was substantially the Roman Psalter, with occasional admixture of other readings. Thus the Anglo-Saxon seems to demand the following distinctively Italic readings, 76, 11., *præter* for *sicut*, 90, 2., *in te* for *in eum*, 91, 10., *tuus* for *meus*, 118, 165., *nomen tuum* for *legem tuam*, 119, 4., *desolatorie* for *desolatoriis*. Similarly, distinctively Gallican readings are demanded at 103, 14., *educas* for *educat*, 118, 151, *iræ* for *mandata*.

J. DOUGLAS BRUCE.

¹ I purposely exclude the numerous examples where the Anglo-Saxon seems to demand the perfect form of a verb of the First Latin Conjugation, 3d. person singular, instead of the future, or vice versa, because the spelling *-avit* in the Old English MSS. seems to have been used regularly to represent the ending *-abit*. Hence the endings of future and perfect in the 3d. person singular were open to confusion. See H. Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, p. 185. Not only in Old English MSS., for s. *Monitum in Psalmos*, p. 1, which introduces Sabatier's Second Volume.